HISTORY PHILOSOPHIC-ALLY

BOHN'S STANDARD LIBRARY.

92. **DANUBIAN PROVINCES.**— RANKE's History of Servia, Servian Revolution Insurrection in Bosnia, and The Slave Provinces of Turkey. Trans. by MRS. KERR

93. **GOETHE'S ELECTIVE AFFINITIES, SORROWS OF WERTHER, GERMAN EMIGRANTS, GOOD WOMEN;** and **A NOUVELETTE.**

94. **THE CARAFAS OF MADDALONI;** Naples under Spanish Dominion. Translated from the German of ALFRED DE ROUMONT. *Portrait of Masaniello.*

97, 109, & 112. **CONDÉ'S HISTORY OF THE ARABS IN SPAIN.** Translated from the Spanish by MRS. FOSTER. In 3 vols. with copious Index. *Frontispiece.*

98 & 104. **LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS,** containing the Essay on the Human Understanding, the Conduct of the Understanding, &c., with Notes by J. A. ST. JOHN, Esq. General Index and a *Portrait.* In 2 vols.

100. **HUNGARY: ITS HISTORY AND REVOLUTIONS.** With a Copious Memoir of KOSSUTH, from new and authentic sources. *Portrait of Kossuth.*

101 & 113. **HISTORY OF RUSSIA** to the present time, compiled from KARAMSIN, TOOKE, and SEGUR, by W. K. KELLY. In 2 vols. with Index, *Portraits of Catherine the Second, Nicholas,* and *Mentschikopf.*

107 & 108. **JAMES'S (G. P. R.) LIFE OF RICHARD CŒUR DE LION.** *Portraits of Richard and Philip Augustus.* Complete in 2 vols.

110 & 111. **SMYTH'S LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY.** New Edition, with the Author's last corrections, and a *General Index.* 2 vols.

114. **GOETHE'S WILHELM MEISTER'S APPRENTICESHIP.** Complete.

115. **BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER,** in a popular form, by LEIGH HUNT.

116, 117. **SMYTH'S LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.** New edition, with the Author's last corrections, an additional Lecture and a General Index. Complete in 2 vols.

118. **MIGNET'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION,** from 1789 to 1814.

119. **GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION OF 1640.** With a Preliminary Essay on its causes and success. Translated by W. HAZLITT.

120, 121, & 122. **GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,** from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated by W. HAZLITT. In 3 vols. With Index, and *Portraits of M. Guizot, Charlemagne, and Louis IX.*

123 & 124. **THIERRY'S HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF ENGLAND BY THE NORMANS.** Translated by W. HAZLITT. In 2 vols. *Portraits.*

125 & 126. **FOSTER'S CRITICAL ESSAYS.** Edited by J. E. RYLAND. In 2 vols.

127. **LUTHER'S TABLE-TALK;** With Life by A. CHALMERS. *Portrait.*

128, 129, 130 & 131. **LAMARTINE'S HISTORY OF THE RESTORATION.** 4 vols. post 8vo., new Edition, with a General Index, and 5 additional *Portraits,* viz., Lamartine, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Ney, and Louis XVII. Cloth.

132. **CARREL'S COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND**—FOX'S HISTORY OF JAMES II.—And LORD LONSDALE'S MEMOIR OF JAMES II. *Portraits.*

133. **STURM'S MORNING COMMUNINGS WITH GOD,** or Devotional Meditations for Every Day in the Year.

134. **FOSTERIANA: THOUGHTS, REFLECTIONS,** and **CRITICISMS** of the late JOHN FOSTER, (Author of Essays of Decision of Character, Popular Ignorance, &c.), selected from periodical papers not hitherto published in a collective form, and edited by HENRY G. BOHN. (Nearly 600 pages). 5*s.*

LIFE AND LETTERS OF JOHN LOCKE; with Extracts from his Letters and Common-Place Books, by LORD KING. New Edition, with general Index.

136 & 137. **NEANDER'S CHURCH HISTORY,** translated from the German. Vol. IX., which completes the work. With a general Index to the nine volumes. In two parts, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

138 & 139. **NEANDER'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOGMAS.** Translated from the German, by J. E. RYLAND. Complete in 2 vols.

140. **THIERRY'S HISTORY OF THE TIERS ETAT,** or Third Estate, in France. 2 vols. in 1. 5*s.*

141. **SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE,** Ancient and Modern. Completely translated, with a General Index.

BOHN'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY.

37. BRIDGEWATER TREATISES. PROUT on Chemistry, Meterology, and the Function of Digestion. Edited by DR. GRIFFITHS. *Coloured Maps.*

38. JOYCE'S SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUES. New and Enlarged Edition, completed in the present state of knowledge by DR. GRIFFITHS. *Numerous Woodcuts.*

39. STOCKHARDT'S AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY: or, CHEMICAL FIELD LECTURES. Addressed to Farmers. With Notes by PROFESSOR HENFREY and a Paper on LIQUID MANURE, by J. J. MECHI, Esq.

40. BLAIR'S CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, REVISED AND ENLARGED; comprehending the Chronology and History of the World to 1856. By J. W. ROSSE, (upwards of 800 pages). Double volume, 10*s.*—or half morocco, 12*s.* 6*d.*

41. BOLLEY'S MANUAL OF TECHNICAL ANALYSIS; a Guide for the Testing of Natural and Artificial Substances, by B. H. PAUL. 100 Wood Engravings.

42 & 47. MANTELL'S WONDERS OF GEOLOGY; 7th edit., revised by T. RUPERT JONES. Coloured Geological Map of England; 200 wood-cuts. 2 vols. 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

43 & 46. CARPENTER'S ZOOLOGY; revised and completed to the present time. 2 vols., (nearly 600 pages each), 6*s.* each. With many hundred Wood Engravings.

44 CARPENTER'S MECHANICAL PHILOSOPHY, ASTRONOMY & HOROLOGY. With 181 Illustrations.

45 & 53. INDEX OF DATES, comprehending the principal Facts in the Chronology and History of the World, from the earliest to the present time. By J. W. ROSSE. two parts, forming one very thick volume, 10*s*; or half morocco, 12*s.* 6*d.*

48 & 49. MANTELL'S MEDALS OF CREATION; or, First Lessons in Geology and in the Study of Organic Remains. 2 thick vols. Second edition, extensively revised, with several hundred wood-cuts of Fossil Remains. The 2 vols. 15*s.*

50. HUMBOLDT'S COSMOS. Vol. V. Terrestrial Phenomena, Volcanoes, Earthquakes, Springs, &c. 5*s.*

51. CARPENTER'S VEGETABLE PHYSIOLOGY AND SYSTEMATIC BOTANY. New edition, carefully revised. 217 Wood Engravings. 6*s.*

52. DE JUSSIEU'S ELEMENTS OF BOTANY. By J. H. WILSON. 750 wood cuts

53. CHEVREUL ON COLOUR; its Harmony, Contrast and Application. By CHARLES MARTEL. (The only edition which gives the entire work). Plates, 5*s.* Or, with the addition of 16 coloured plates, 7*s.* 6*d.*

BOHN'S ILLUSTRATED LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *at* 5*s. per volume.*

1 to 8. LODGE'S PORTRAITS OF ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONAGES OF GREAT BRITAIN. 8 Vols., post 8vo. 240 *Portraits.*

9. CRUIKSHANK'S THREE COURSES AND DESSERT, with 50 *Illustrations.*

10. PICKERING'S RACES OF MAN. With numerous *Portraits,* (or coloured 7*s.* 6*d.*)

11. KITTO'S SCRIPTURE LANDS, AND BIBLICAL ATLAS, with 24 *Maps,* 5*s.* Coloured, 7*s.* 6*d.*

12. WHITE'S SELBORNE, by SIR WILLIAM JARDINE and E. JESSE. 40 *fine Wood Engravings,* 5*s.* Or, coloured, 7*s.* 6*d.*

13. DIDRON'S CHRISTIAN ICONOGRAPHY. *With* 150 *Engravings.* Vol. I.

14. REDDING ON WINES. New and Revised Edition, *with* 20 *beautiful Woodcuts.*

15 & 16. ALLEN'S BATTLES OF THE BRITISH NAVY. New Edition. Enlarged by the Author. *Numerous fine Portraits* on Steel. 2 Vols.

17 & 18. ROME IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Fifth Edition, in 2 Vols., *with* 34 *fine Steel Engravings,* and Index.

19. MAXWELL'S VICTORIES OF WELLINGTON AND THE BRITISH ARMIES, *with Engravings on Steel.*

20. LIFE OF WELLINGTON, by "AN OLD SOLDIER," compiled from the materials of Maxwell; with an Account of the Funeral. 18 *highly-finished steel Engravings.*

21. MARY AND WM. HOWITT'S STORIES OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LIFE, *with* 20 *beautiful Steel Engravings.*

22. BECHSTEIN'S CAGE and CHAMBER BIRDS, including SWEET'S Warblers. New Edition, greatly enlarged, *numerous Plates* (*or Coloured,* 7*s.* 6*d.*)

23. NORWAY AND ITS SCENERY, comprising PRICE'S Journal, with large Additions and a Road Book. Edited by THOS. FORESTER, Esq. *With* 22 *Illustrations, beautifully Engraved on Steel by Lucas.*

*** The Road Book is sold separately, price 2*s.*

HISTORY,

PHILOSOPHICALLY ILLUSTRATED,

FROM

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,

TO

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

BY

GEORGE MILLER, D.D., M.R.I.A.,

VICAR GENERAL OF ARMAGH; FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, AND LECTURER ON MODERN HISTORY.

Third Edition,

REVISED BY THE AUTHOR.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.—VOL. IV.

LONDON:
H. G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
1854.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME THE FOURTH.

BOOK IV.

MODERN HISTORY, FROM THE BRITISH REVOLUTION IN THE YEAR 1688 TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION IN THE YEAR 1789.

MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR.*

DEATH, that unsparing claimant of mankind, has taken from amongst us another bright ornament of our Church! We have lost a steady friend in this our time of need, God having been pleased to remove him, in a good old age, from a state of trial to (we trust) a state of bliss. And when we contemplate the threatening aspect of affairs as regards the Church established within these realms, and think upon the services which for so long a series of years we have all received from that tried and faithful champion, whose principles stood firm to the close of an active and useful life, we feel the loss in all its bitterness, and are constrained to ask, what man was more required at the present day? "I myself," writes a valued friend, "feel like one desolate. For so many years I was aided by his counsels, and strengthened by his example; and when I look around, I seek in vain for the high-minded devotion to principle, the resolute sense of right, which made him like a guiding-star in these doubtful times of self-seeking and expediency. But, God's will be done!" The Lord Omnipotent is not in need of any human instrument. Yet still, our loss is truly great. We wanted such a one to stir us up, and to keep us to our duty; but we must not indulge in any vain regrets. Long, unusually long, was he spared to his family, and friends, and admirers, in the full enjoyment of a vigorous mind. His end, too, was happy; for he lived as he should have lived, and he died as he had lived, trusting implicitly in the work of his Redeemer. He, therefore, has not left us without that sense of comfort which springs from the closing scene of a sincere believer's course on earth; and confident may we be (so far as such confidence is allowed to men) that "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ,"

* Reprinted, with some alterations, from "The Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine," for November and December, 1848.

he is now enjoying the blessed consummation of the prayer so beautifully expressed in a well known hymn—

"Oh! for a closer walk with God,
A calm and heavenly frame;
A light to shine upon the road
That leads us to the Lamb!"

George Miller, distinguished for his many services in theology and literature, was born in Dublin on the 22nd October, 1764, being the eldest son, but third living child, of Stephen Miller, who was for many years a general merchant in that city, and was remarkable for the soundness of his understanding, and the most scrupulous integrity. "I remember," writes the son,* "that when an annuity-company was broken up, in consequence of the failure of the calculation on which it had been established, and a small balance of money remained in his hands, as one of the members, he delivered it to the secretary, refusing to retain it, though there was no claimant. On another occasion, his sense of fairness, bordering on the romantic, did him eventually considerable service. Having taken a house, which he had obtained on very advantageous terms, because it had been discredited by the bankruptcy of the last occupant, perhaps of more than the last; and having found in the books of his predecessor, which remained in the house, that he had failed in debt to Mr. Barton, of Bourdeaux, to the amount of £20, he wrote to Mr. Barton that he had benefited so much by the bankruptcy in the bargain concluded for the house, that he thought himself bound in fairness not to suffer a stranger to be at a loss by it, and sent him payment of the debt. The consequence was, that in his mercantile dealings he obtained the entire confidence of that respectable house. A very cunning man might, indeed, have acted thus through a desire of obtaining that confidence; but my father had no cunning, and was of very limited means, with an increasing family, so that even that small sum was important to him. Though he had received only such an education as was necessary for a mercantile life, his opinions in all matters of business were universally received with respect; and I remember, that after divine service on a Sunday he used

* We quote here, and throughout this sketch from some brief "Reminiscences," written by Dr. Miller within the last few years.

frequently to take me with him on a round of visits to two or three mercantile friends, that he might by advising them in their embarrassments, afford them that assistance which he could not give them at any other time." We have given these few traits of character, inasmuch as they must have influenced the conduct of the son, and so have laid the foundation of that love of truth and spirit of independence which marked him, we may say, from the cradle to the grave; and which, if they did not raise him to the highest rank in his profession, rendered him an object of universal respect. Indeed, they furnish one more attestation to the truth of what Mr. Anderson has so forcibly put forward in his "Domestic Constitution"—*the great moral influence of the good example of the parent upon the future happiness and welfare of the child.*

His father being impressed with the great advantage of education, "I was," he says, "sent to a school* [Mr. Darling's] very early, where I learned at the age of six to read correctly and fluently. My original destination was for India, my father having a friend [Mr. Mears] in that country, by whom he had reason to expect that I would be protected; but the friend died, and my destination was to be formed anew. My father had still, indeed, a near relative connected with India, but whose course was too adventurous and irregular, for a man so prudent as my father to have much dependence upon him.† . . . Before I was eight years

* Tone likewise was "sent," as he himself informs us, "to an excellent *English* school, kept by Sisson Darling, a man to whose kindness and affection I was much indebted, and who took more than common pains with me."—To what little purpose!

† This was Lachlan Maclean, the son of a clergyman in the North of Ireland, and by many considered to be the author of "Junius's Letters."—(see Cooke's "History of Party," vol. iii. p. 141-152.) His life was one of strange adventure. "Having studied medicine in Edinburgh, he proceeded to Philadelphia, in America, where he connected himself with a druggist or apothecary. In consequence of an intrigue, he found it necessary to remove to Canada, where his talents and address procured him friends, by whom he was recommended to the West Indies. I think in the latter situation he became connected with the governor, Lord Hillsborough [? Shelburne], with whom he went to England; and when his patron became a cabinet minister, he was constituted his secretary, and as such was introduced into the English House of Commons. He was disqualified by nature for playing the

old, I had learned so much of the French language as to read 'Telemachus' for my own gratification; and I soon afterwards wrote a translation of several books of that work. I was then placed under the care of a half-mad teacher, named Nixon, who became partial to me, and would, in his regard for me, have made me a very bad scholar, by pushing me forward with an unwise rapidity. However, I was happily taken from his care, and placed under the tuition of a dull, plodding person, named [Rev. William] Craig, who gave me the drilling which I required, but certainly did nothing to inspire a love of learning, and left me to shift for myself three or four months before I entered College, because my class-fellows had broken up the class by entering prematurely. On this account I never felt any regard for him, while for Nixon I did feel some, because he was much interested for me. . . . . Among all my school-fellows two only have attained public distinction—these were Theobald Wolfe Tone, the rebel, and Charles Kendal Bushe, the present Chief Justice [since dead]—a rather whimsical combination. Of the two, the former may be considered as the more distinguished, for he has secured for himself a place in history, as the founder of the treasonable society of United Irishmen. Tone was one of the pleasantest companions, and was, accordingly, the most popular character in Craig's school. He had the vivacity of a Frenchman, with great acuteness, which was counteracted only by a levity of character, disqualifying him for any continued effort of attention. He was at all times disposed to show kindness, and ready to engage in every frolic. His favourite amusement consisted in drilling a little corps. He afterwards persuaded a number of us to form a debating society, and to hold weekly meetings. We accordingly met with great gravity about six times, and framed, with precision and detail, a code of regulations for the future guidance of our debates ; but

orator, having a considerable hesitation in his speech; but he did sometimes speak, and I remember that I once met with a report of one of his speeches. From England he went, I suppose under the patronage of Lord Hillsborough, to India, where it was then not difficult to acquire a fortune. He accordingly became rich, and returned to England, where his acquisition was soon dissipated. He then went a second time to India, where he acquired a second fortune; but, in again returning to England, he was lost, with all his property, at the entrance of the Red Sea."—Dr. Miller's "Reminiscences."

when this was happily accomplished, and we proceeded to the discussions for which our society had been formed, we discovered, what we might have anticipated, that we did not possess the necessary information, or know where to find it, and we ceased to meet. Poor Tone was always ready for anything, for he had a great facility in quoting Shakspeare, and in raising a laugh by a pun."

Mr. Miller's destination to be a Fellow of the College was determined by the casual connexion of his father with Dr. Law, the rector of St. Mary's parish, who had been one of that body. His father, as churchwarden, had been serviceable to the rector, by advising him in some parochial difficulties in which he was involved ; and in return the rector, who had frequently visited Mr. Craig's school, and perhaps had there acquired some knowledge of the boy, pointed out the eligibility of such a destination, and gave all the encouragement and countenance in his power. With this view "I was entered in the University in July, 1779, being then under the age of fifteen. My tutor was the Rev. Matthew Young, the most popular member of the body, and one of the first mathematicians in Europe. But having been sent away from my school as a troublesome supernumerary in the preceding March, and not having direction in urging me to any special, or even continued preparation, I obtained little distinction, being ranked the fifth of thirty. The first place was gained by John Sealy Townsend, now one of the Masters in Chancery [since retired], and the third or fourth by William Conyngham Plunket, afterwards Lord Chancellor. These two, and Dean Graves, who entered afterwards for the same class, were all my collegiate class-fellows who attained any eminence in after-life. In my division Townsend took the lead, but did not keep it. He gained the first premium, which he well deserved, being a very clever fellow ; but he soon yielded the precedency, for I took it at the fourth examination, and held it to the second of the last year, when Plunket stopped my certificate upon equal answering." In 1782, at the usual time, he was elected a Scholar—Plunket, Townsend, and Graves, who eventually became Regius Professor of Divinity and Dean of Ardagh, being likewise on the list of successful candidates.

In the Historical Society, which had been founded about

twenty years before by Henry Grattan and some of his contemporaries, and in which Plunket and Bushe now took the leading part, Mr. Miller's emulation also was excited; and during two years he gave himself up to the attractions of present applause, neglecting his proper business, which was to read for a fellowship. "Some advantage, indeed, I derived from this digression, for I acquired a knowledge of composition, which was afterwards useful in the preparation of my lectures on history, and forty years later than my practice in the Society, I found that I was not unprepared for delivering political speeches on several occasions, when the struggles of the Roman Catholic question had brought me forward in public meetings. . . But I was at length roused from this forgetfulness of my destination, and [in 1787] I answered for a fellowship creditably, though unsuccessfully. Whitley Stokes was elected, and deservedly.* I then applied myself more steadily to my business, and again became a candidate, but without success. Magee [afterwards Archbishop of Dublin] was elected, who answered well, but, as I thought, not equally with myself. Being confirmed in this opinion of our comparative answering, by the decided judgment, both of Stokes, then a Fellow, and of Russell, who afterwards became one, I resented the decision of the Board as a wrong, and prevailed with my father to permit me to withdraw my name from the college, and to enter it at the Middle Temple. I accordingly passed the summer in reading Blackstone; but in October, when I was preparing to go to London, a vacancy occurred, and I was persuaded to try another chance. This time I proved successful [in May, 1789], being unanimously elected."†

* Magee obtained the first, and Miller the second premium. The present Theatre of Trinity College was first opened for this examination.

† In a letter, dated 30th April, 1841, he writes—"I suffered a much more considerable disappointment when I failed to obtain a fellowship, to which well-informed friends assured me I was justly entitled by my answering. I did not permit it to depress me, but set to work at once to read Blackstone. . . . .
Never suffer yourself to look backward with regret; look forward and do your best. Many have been my disappointments, and yet, upon the whole, I have lived a very happy life."

It was at this period of Mr. Miller's life that an incident occurred, by which " his miraculous integrity" was severely tried. But let us first give the circumstances in his own words:—

" A few weeks before this last trial, I received a visit in an evening from a Mr. Adair, then living in the family of Provost Hutchinson, I think as a private tutor of one of his sons, to me an utter stranger. His object was to communicate some very corrupt offers, by which I was to be seduced to the party of the Provost, in his schemes for gaining for his son the representation of the University in the [Irish] House of Commons. To account for this very extraordinary proceeding, I must remark that I had some years before, when I obtained a scholarship, been induced to promise my vote to the family, which, however, was of no value, as I was then only eighteen years old.* I have also to remark, that I had openly expressed my resentment for my failure at the preceding election, and shunned all intercourse with the Senior Fellows, as persons who had done me wrong. It was, therefore, not unreasonable that the Provost should consider me as a person fit for his purposes, and venture to send his agent to secure me. Adair began with representing how probable it was that the Senior Fellows would follow up the wrong which they had already done me, by again excluding me at the approaching trial, as they could not but consider me as a person who, if elected, would manifest resentment by thwarting them in all their plans. He then told me that the Provost was anxious to prevent this repetition of wrong, and was determined, if necessary, to exercise in my favour the power of nominating;† and that, to make it more sure, that I should come within the reach of such an

* " It is stated that I had, when a Scholar, promised my vote to the Hutchinsons, 'whenever it might become available at an election.' This is expressed too generally. I did promise my vote for an election then approaching [in 1783], because it was the custom to solicit the votes of minors, though ineffectual, in order to gain a greater appearance of strength. This promise I discharged by a triple *tie* with two other minor Scholars; and it is evident, from the offers made by Adair, that no further performance was expected from me."—*Letter to the Editor of the Dublin University Magazine, July*, 1841.

† By "nominating," was meant the appointment of a Fellow by the Provost, in opposition to the sense of the majority of the Board.

exercise of power, he was willing to communicate to me the list of questions which he intended to ask in examining in the course of moral philosophy. I had, I think, three interviews with Adair, all in the dusk of the evening; and in one of these he reinforced his original offers by assuring me that the Provost would, by his influence with the Government, procure a professorship of morality to be founded, with a salary of £100, and that I should be named the first professor.* I had no difficulty in resolving not to accept the corrupt offers which were thus presented to me; nor for this can I claim much credit. I had twice measured myself with others, and knew my own strength; and I did not much apprehend a repetition of wrong from the electors, who, I thought, would even be inclined to compensate me for my disappointment in any favourable circumstances. But the difficulty was, to decline them without provoking an exercise of the very same power of nomination to my prejudice. My expedient, when I was pressed for an explicit declaration, was to break out into a paroxysm of violent resentment against the Senior Fellows, for their conduct at the preceding election. Whether this was taken for a favourable answer I do not know, but it had the effect of freeing me from the necessity of committing myself by any explicit declaration. On the Saturday before the examination I received an invitation to dine the next day with Lord Donoughmore; it may be supposed, that I might be induced to speak out. I declined the invitation, on the plea of business. After the morning examination of the first day, I received a note of congratulation on the distinction which I had so far obtained. This was the last effort of Adair. It so happened that I gained advantage in every part of the trial, and my success was undisputed. The power, however, of which I had been offered the favourable, and apprehended the unfavourable exercise, was actually exerted in the following year, to the exclusion of a candidate named Allen, who had disappointed the Hutchinsons at an election. It was then exposed, as having no sufficient foundation in the statutes of the College, by my

* This honour was reserved for one very lately deceased, the Rev. William Archer Butler. By Provost Lloyd's exertion, the professorship was founded in 1837, and Mr. Butler appointed to the post.

tutor, Dr. Young [afterwards Bishop of Clonfert], in a very able dissertation,* and was from that time abandoned. . . .

"In these earlier years of my collegiate life, I had twice an opportunity of coming forward to expose the corrupt practices of Provost Hutchinson. One of his sons [Hon. Francis Hely Hutchinson], having been returned by him to represent the University, I think in the year 1790, a petition was lodged by Lord Rosse, then Mr. Lawrence Parsons, the defeated candidate, and in the committee formed to try it, I was produced as a witness, and swore to the conversations which Adair had held with me. My testimony was unavailing, because the offers which he had made were not accepted; but it served to discredit the Provost, an object which, with very good reason, we all had at heart. It was afterwards said that I had taken advantage of the absence of Adair, to make statements which I would not dare to make in his presence. But I had soon an opportunity of repelling the insinuation. The measure of the iniquity of Hutchinson was full; and the Fellows, Senior and Junior, with only two or three exceptions, called a Visitation for the purpose of proving his entire unworthiness. At that Visitation I saw Adair present, though in a backward position, and I immediately interrupted the proceedings, stating that I had in an election-committee sworn to certain charges against Mr. Adair; that it had been said, that in doing so I had taken advantage of his absence; that I saw him then present; and that in my own vindication I was ready to repeat them. Adair was called forward, and I repeated my statements of the two offers of a nomination, and of a list of questions, and added that of a professorship, which I had before forgotten and omitted. Old Hutchinson then, driven fairly to the wall, turned upon his unfortunate agent, utterly denied that he had commissioned him to make any offers to me, and reproached him in the severest language for having

* "An Inquiry how far the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, is invested with a negative on the proceedings of the Senior Fellows, by the charter and statutes of the College; with the opinions of Counsel thereon. Dublin, 1790." This publication, as Archbishop Magee has remarked, "would do honour to the ablest and best informed legal understanding." His scientific labours have not received their appropriate reward. See Will's "Lives of Irishmen," vol. vi. p. 158.

abused the confidence reposed in him, in allowing him that access to his papers, by which he had the opportunity of purloining his questions. This little episode ended in an order of the Visitors, excluding Adair from the precincts of the University. I do not remember whether his name was then on the books, so that he might be liable to a formal expulsion. The agent being thus sacrificed, Hutchinson affected to consider himself as exonerated from all imputation; but Adair was long after, notwithstanding the alleged perfidy, domesticated at Knocklofty, the country-seat of the family, who, however, it must be said, never made any provision for him."

We have given the account of this strange transaction in full, because, in whatever light it is viewed, it places the character of the person tempted in a highly honourable position. We are aware indeed, that it has been said by many, that the Provost could not have been cognizant of the offers made in his name, and that Adair, like almost every electioneering agent, exceeded his instructions; but even supposing this to have been the case, (which supposition we are compelled, upon good grounds to set aside,) we can easily imagine the agitating influence which the offers of Adair, believed, as they were, to have been authorized at the time, and so believed by Dr. Miller to the day of his death, must necessarily have had upon the anxious candidate—

"For let the man of the proudest virtue amongst you," said the late Peter Burrowes, who acted as one of the counsel before the committee, "ask himself, was his refusal to be expected? Let the most cautious ask, what was the apparent hazard that such a proposal would be rejected and exposed? Let the seducer enjoy the benefit of every inference which can be drawn from cunning against profligacy; but let not the virtue of one man be reasoned from, in exculpation of another of a very different cast, nor let it be deemed incredible folly in a veteran politician, that he did not expect to meet miraculous integrity. . . . You have seen young ambition panting to pursue the invitation of ardent genius, and wily seduction watching a favourable crisis, when rigid principle might be relaxed in the hot pursuit; and, thank heaven! you have seen honour

triumphant over ambition, and the brightest talents, and their most alluring calls, subjected to paramount integrity. You have seen the student, on the eve of his third experiment for fellowships, while his mind was fainting under the severity of prolonged and reiterated study, and ease, honour, and competency were floating before him—at this moment of mental and bodily lassitude, you have seen his principles assailed by an offer of what he was dying to enjoy; and if the corrupt logic of the age shall not persuade you that such heroic self-denial is incredible, you have seen such sordid overtures nobly spurned, and the short path to infamous prosperity deserted with scorn."*

The only further observations we shall make upon this topic of our sketch, are these: that, as we have seen, Dr. Miller, with his manly simplicity of character, took little or no credit to himself for rejecting the proposals; and that he was ready to yield praise to Provost Hutchinson, wherever praise was due.

The great object of his ambition had been gained with considerable credit, and he was henceforth in an assured position, and independent. He was now admitted to holy orders, and became desirous of acquiring some further knowledge of his profession; but we will not say that, in doing so, he felt that deep sense of Christian responsibility by which he was afterwards influenced in the course he pursued. The young student of theology was not then, as now, guided by books framed expressly for his use.

"I was accordingly," he informs us, "under a necessity of seeking direction from two persons whom I most respected. These happened to be Arians. By one [Y], I was strongly advised to read the letters [by Taylor], published under the name of 'Ben Mordecai,' a regular and very able defence of the Arian doctrine: by the other [B], I was

* See "A full and accurate Report of the Proceedings in the Case of the Borough of Trinity College, Dublin, as heard before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, A.D. 1791." Dublin, 1791. In this work we have a full account of these remarkable proceedings, in which Mr. Miller took so leading a part. His conduct was, in fact, a sample of that uncompromising integrity, by which he was marked throughout a long career.

taught to consider the Athanasian Creed as a monstrous contradiction of revealed truth. Yet I do not know that this beginning was unfortunate. Though strongly impressed at the time with Arian opinions, I have long since renounced every tendency of that kind; and, having then been much influenced in their favour, I have now the satisfaction of feeling that my present opinions have been formed by myself in the course of careful inquiry, instead of having been traditionally received in the progress of education."

To furnish a complete narrative of all the stirring incidents in the life of such a man, would be no less than to fill a large-sized folio; we must, therefore, be satisfied with a small selection. But our chief object is, of course, to delineate his character as correctly as possible; and, happily, we have the aid of his own "Reminiscences," which must prove far more interesting than any account which we could supply. The following paragraph illustrates his firmness and decision at an early age:—

"That Visitation [of which mention has been made] it had been found very difficult to obtain, the Visitors being reluctant, especially Lord Clare, at that time Lord Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University. Of him we were all more or less afraid, as he was very haughty in his general deportment, and was believed to be well disposed to gratify his resentment against the Fellows for his failure at an election for the University, of which he had been a representative. As it had been found impracticable to induce him to name a time for the Visitation, I was selected, as the sturdiest of the junior members, to bring him to the point. Knowing the sort of man with whom I had to deal, I observed all caution. I went to his house in my academic dress; and having been announced, I informed him quietly of the purpose of my visit. He received me with courtesy, probably hoping to parry an application sent by so young a messenger. He asked me to be seated, and addressed me in a speech of some length, the object of which was to dissuade me and the other Fellows from proceeding. I do not remember his topics, nor did I at the time much attend to them, being fully determined to persist. I accordingly sat, waiting patiently until he had concluded, and then, as quietly as before, said merely that my commission extended no fur-

ther than to ask him to name a day for the Visitation. Offended that his courtesy and eloquence had been so thrown away, he started up from his seat, and thumping the table with his fist, said, 'Well, then, let it be next Wednesday.' My object was attained, so I bowed and retired. . .The Visitation was accordingly held; but it was understood to be limited to three days, as in the statutes the Visitors are earnestly exhorted not to prolong it beyond that time. Each day the court was opened about eleven o'clock, and closed at four. The three days thus comprehended about fourteen hours and a half. Of this time Hutchinson, being eminently qualified to speak against time, engrossed nine hours. When, therefore, the clock struck four on the third day, we had not gone through our charges; the Visitors, however, rose, as at the close of the time permitted to such an investigation, and we all walked away like fools, having had no opportunity of pressing for any result. In the management of this great prosecution, ten or twelve charges had been distinctly prepared, one of which, I remember, went so far as to state the utter absence of all qualification for the office of Provost. These were all subscribed by the prosecuting Fellows, old Murray, the Vice-Provost, being at their head, and were then committed to the advocacy of different Fellows. One was assigned to me, the subject of which I have forgotten. I prepared myself as well as I could for my statement, which I began in my turn. I was, however, soon stopped by Lord Clare, who objected to my topic. I yielded, and proceeded to some other, but took care to come round soon to that which I had been forced to abandon. I was again stopped, and had recourse to the like manœuvre. He then suffered me to proceed, and I finished my statement."

Those who are acquainted with the history of the University of Dublin, must be aware, that in the appointment to the responsible office of Provost, political considerations too frequently outweighed the interests of religion and learning; and that the *incumbency* of Provost Hutchinson, whose conduct ill became his station, though "he was acknowledged to have been distinguished by professional eminence,"* gives

* The satirical remark of Lord North is well known, that "if Hutchinson had England and Ireland given to him, he would still solicit the Isle of Man for a potato garden." There was too much truth in

too correct a picture of ministerial-jobbing in Ireland towards the close of the last century. It is true that the appointment of a layman was in direct opposition to the statutes; but a king's letter could be obtained, and difficulties made to vanish before the influence of party. Thus, Dr. Andrews, who preceded Hutchinson, though a layman, was appointed to the Provostship, and owed his elevation to political motives; and yet, notwithstanding the fact of his having been a Senior Fellow, much animadversion was naturally excited.* How much more strongly, then, would public opinion be expressed against Hutchinson, who had not any of the recommendations possessed by his predecessor. His appointment gave occasion to the most serious disturbances, which agitated the University during twenty years; and, therefore, the efforts used by the Fellows to prevent a repetition of such calamities ought not to pass unnoticed. We are the more inclined to enter into particulars, Mr. Miller having had the principal share in all these proceedings, which terminated in a manner so satisfactory to that body, of which he had already become a very distinguished member. The following is his own account of this affair, which, though long, we cannot omit:—

"I do not at this distance of time remember the order of the occurrences of this period of my life, though I have a distinct memory of the occurrences themselves, having taken in them all a very forward and active part. In some part of it, I think towards the end of the summer in 1793, the same party of the Fellows, almost the whole body, judged it expedient to petition the Ministers against an appointment of another Provost to succeed Hutchinson upon his [expected]

what his lordship said. Dr. Duigenan, in his "Lachrymæ Academicæ," did not spare him; but that work is too highly tinctured with the party spirit of the day. On the other hand, the Provost has not been without his admirers—see Hardy's "Memoirs of the Earl of Charlemont," vol. i. p. 144; and Wills' "Lives of Irishmen," vol. v. p. 233.

* For a memoir of Provost Andrews, see "The Ordnance Survey of the County of Londonderry," vol. i. p. 93. The statutes (cap. ii.) required the Provost to be in holy orders, a Doctor or Bachelor in Divinity, and at least thirty years of age; but the Crown having reserved to itself, by the charter of Charles I., the power of changing and ordaining statutes, thought proper to make the alteration in favour of Dr. Andrews. The restrictions had been observed since the time of Sir William Temple, who died while Provost, in 1626.

resignation. The person apprehended was Wolfe, the Attorney-General, and afterwards Lord Kilwarden. It was well known that he was not satisfied with the office of attorney-general, but anxious to quit it for any other. To this persuasion he himself gave countenance; for when Grattan had contemptuously designated him a *miserable* attorney-general, he had the folly to assure the House of Commons that he felt himself quite happy. Lord Rosse indeed told me that Wolfe, when he was drunk, had once said to him that the Provostship was the object nearest to his heart. A petition was accordingly prepared, I think by myself, and signed by all the opposition party except Dr. [John] Kearney, afterwards himself Provost [and Bishop of Ossory]. He had so much cultivated the friendship of Lord Clare, that it was thought very improbable that he would affix his name, and those who were intimate with him were unwilling to ask him; I was, therefore, deputed to wait upon him with the petition. It was, I think, the month of September, and he was residing at a lodging-house beyond Blackrock. On my arrival, I was informed that he was walking in the garden. I went and told him my business. He made no reply, nor did I urge my argument; but we walked together for about half an hour in perfect silence. At the end of this time, during which I suppose he had been weighing the consequences in his own mind, he told me that he would affix his name to the petition. He was an honourable man, and though we did not always agree, a warm friendship subsisted between us from that time. He made me a very satisfactory return for the trouble which I had taken in going to ask him, perhaps, too, for my confidence in his honourable conduct, and even for my reserve, in not attempting to influence his mind; for, at a meeting of the Fellows, which he attended in consequence, he proposed and carried that I should be one of the deputies sent to England with the petition. It was determined to send two Senior and two Junior Fellows. The former were, Drs. Young and Hall, [afterwards Bishop of Dromore]; the latter, Hodgkinson [the late Vice-Provost] and myself.

"It had been previously arranged with the Marquis of Abercorn, by others of the body, that he should interest himself in the business with Mr. Pitt, in consideration of

which it was proposed that we should bring into the representation of the University the late [Hon.] George Knox, who looked to the Marquis as his political leader. In this arrangement I had no personal concern, but I concurred in it, and afterwards acted upon it. The Marquis accordingly sent a letter of introduction for the two Seniors, who were in consequence admitted to the Minister, but without receiving any present satisfaction.

"The whole business was one of much delicacy, and required great caution and secrecy; for it was, in fact, to petition the Government against an apprehended misdeed of the Lord Lieutenant, and against the probable concurrence of Lord Clare, the Vice-Chancellor. We, however, made good our departure from Ireland undiscovered, and proceeded on our way to London. Having received from Lord Charlemont a letter recommending us to Edmund Burke, we enquired for him when we had arrived at Beaconsfield, [his seat in Buckinghamshire], and being informed that he was then dining with a party in the village, we sent him the letter. He came to us at eight o'clock, and we had an extraordinary conversation on the subject of our mission. He asked what was the appointment, of which we were apprehensive; and when we mentioned Mr. Wolfe, he said, to our great dismay, that he did not know why he should be required to interfere with the views of that gentleman. He then told us that we might feel assured that the whole matter was already settled; that we should certainly fail if we proceeded, and be laughed at when we returned; and that our best plan was to turn about at once, and go home immediately. From Mr. Burke we had expected only that he would prevent any opposition on the part of our Chancellor, the Duke of Gloucester, with whom he was believed to have much influence. Our two senior members were so much discouraged by the reception which our plan had experienced, where we expected support, that, when our visitor had retired, they began to confer in one corner of the little parlour, on the expediency of following the counsel which had just been given. When I perceived this, I went over to Hodgkinson, who was at the opposite side, perhaps musing on the same subject, and told him in a whisper that I had the petition in my possession, and that, if he would stand

by me, I would let the two Seniors go home, and manage the matter without them. We both forgot that Dr. Hall held the purse, and that we had not sufficient money for a separate operation.

"But our perplexity was soon removed; for at the hour of ten, Burke returned to us from his party, that he might hold a second conversation on the subject. In this he still said that we should fail; but he no longer represented the effort as ridiculous. On the contrary, he told us, that he was then of opinion, that it would be respectable to do all in our power, and advised us to persevere. Our little council recovered its spirits, and determined to proceed to London at six o'clock the next morning. At that hour, when we were starting, we were agreeably surprised to see Burke, who had walked in from his villa to visit us once more, and to cheer us on our way. He told us that he had been thinking of our business the whole night; that he thought it possible we might be successful; that the effort was in any event respectable; and that he wished us success with all his heart. He added, however, that the Duke of Gloucester was a mere cipher, and that no good could be done for us with him. This exhibition of the struggle in the mind of such a man, between political jobbing and native integrity, combined with the love of learning, seemed to me very curious and interesting.

"We departed from Beaconsfield much elevated from our late depression. In the published account of the next levee we read the name of Burke, who had probably come to countenance the deputation; but we were not then ready for our public presentation, as it was deemed necessary to hold previous communication with Mr. Pitt and Mr. Dundas, and we neither saw nor heard any more of Burke.

"We had soon afterwards an interview, by appointment, with Mr. Dundas, though not indeed until some days had elapsed, so as to allow time for communication between him and the Provost, who was then at Buxton. On our way to his office we left our names at the Duke of Gloucester's house, which proved useful in our interview. It was manifest in our conversation that he spoke from instructions received from Buxton, particularly towards the conclusion, when he reproached us with having come away without

having had any communication with the Chancellor. My colleagues were embarrassed by this charge, it being perfectly true that we had been guilty of this disrespect towards the Chancellor of Ireland. So I took upon me to answer, by puzzling Mr. Dundas, in which I was successful. I knew very well that he spoke of Lord Clare; for it was in this manner that the Provost would have spoken of him, and I saw that he was speaking from instructions; but I replied as if he had meant the Chancellor of the University, and I said that we had waited upon him on our way. This perplexed him, and he put an end to a conversation, the object of which, on his part, had been to dissuade us from persisting. We then inquired whether we could be admitted to an audience of the King. This was denied; and we were directed to attend at the next levee.

"The levee was held agreeably to the ancient fashion, which has been exploded by George IV. In the upper part of the room was an ancient bed, covered with an old quilt of crimson velvet, and the King went round his visitors. Of Dr. Young he enquired when he had left Ireland, and of Dr. Hall when he would return; while for Hodgkinson and myself he had not any questions. We delivered our petition to an attendant nobleman, and though we received no answer, our purpose was accomplished. Mr. Pitt was present, but did not speak to any of us, and looked very surly.

"In the following year [4th September] the Provostship became vacant by the death of Hutchinson. On this occasion it was not thought proper to send another petition; but Hodgkinson was sent singly to make a representation to the Duke of Portland of the necessity of appointing a clergyman, not a layman, to fill the vacant situation. He had accordingly an interview with his Grace, and, I believe, received an assurance that this rule should be observed. He also saw Mr. Burke; and I remember that he reported these words as used by him—'*If you separate learning from religion, learning will destroy religion*'—words most applicable to certain discussions of the present day! But we were soon alarmed by the apprehension of an appointment falling within the rule, yet very distasteful to us all. For it was said that the Provostship was to be given to Dr. Bennet, then Bishop of Cloyne, and Private Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. He

had been a collegiate man, respected for his attainments in literature. Our objection to him was, that he was not one of our own body. The matter had proceeded so far, that the Bishop's housekeeper had gone to the Provost's House to examine the premises. We were in despair; for though we had succeeded in averting the repetition of the gross and scandalous job, which had intruded a lawyer and statesman amongst us, we saw that we had no prospect of recovering the office to the body. In this state of mind we held a very gloomy consultation in the chambers of Dr. Hall. At this meeting the mildest man of the whole number prepared a most ferocious resolution, which was at once unanimously adopted. This was no less than to send to the Bishop a deputation of two of the body, to remonstrate with him on the intrusion, and to give him to understand, in very explicit terms, that if he should persist, he might bid adieu to peace for the remainder of his days! The proposer of this atrocious denunciation was the late Dr. Joseph Stopford,* who, probably, at no other time of his life, had done or suggested anything violent. We all agreed to try it as a last measure of desperation. The menace, however, was not an empty one; for Hutchinson had been held up to public scorn, and made miserable amidst all his success. The address was prepared in the full spirit of the proposer, by Dr. Hall, and it was the best thing he ever wrote. He and Dr. [Thomas] Elrington [afterwards Bishop of Ferns] went formally to the Bishop and read it. The Bishop, who was a timorous man, became alarmed for his future comfort, and withdrew his pretensions; and Murray, the Vice-Provost, whom we all desired, was appointed in his place.

"It was, however, decidedly contrary to his own wish that Murray was appointed. He was then sixty-eight years old, of a warm, though controlled temper, and sincerely desirous of passing the remainder of his days in that quiet seclusion in which he had so long lived. His object had been to procure the Provostship for an old friend, Dean Hamilton,† of Armagh, who had been a respected Fellow and

* He was elder brother to the present Bishop of Meath, and died, while rector of Conwall, in the diocese of Raphoe, 30th March, 1833. We find many interesting particulars respecting him in Madden's "Memoir of the Life of the Rev. Peter Roe."

† See Wills' "Lives of Irishmen," vol. vi. p. 162.

Professor in the University. I remember that on one occasion, while this matter was in agitation, I was in his chamber with him, but in a different part of the room, conversing privately with another of the Fellows. When our conversation had ended, I went over to Dr. Murray, who, much to my surprise, asked me of what we had been talking. I made no reply, for we had actually been talking of his chance of the Provostship, to which we knew him to be adverse. 'I protest,' said he, 'if I thought there was any design of making me Provost, I would write to the Duke of Portland, desiring that it might not be done.' This he said with the vehemence natural to him when excited. The appointment, however, being made, he submitted to the general wish, saying, at the same time, that he was sure it would shorten his days. Perhaps it did so; for it was seen that he no longer had his temper under the same control as before. He lived about four years, and served just to commence what may be called the *home-succession*."*

In the previous year (1793), during part of which, as we have seen, Mr. Miller was so actively engaged, he had the principal share in two other important struggles. In these, he was unfortunately opposed to many of his brethren, with whom he had, in the former case, co-operated in pursuits conducive to their common advantage; yet, nevertheless, it will readily be granted that on this, as on all former occasions, he was actuated by the very same high spirit of unflinching honesty. At a later period, indeed, he saw good reasons for a change in his opinions; but this is nothing to the point at present. We shall avail ourselves of his own account:—

"I was, in the year 1793, engaged in two other struggles, by the liberal spirit towards Roman Catholics, in which I then participated, as it was the prevailing spirit of the time, especially among the young. In one of these I was opposed to the Senior Fellows, in the other to the Vice-Chancellor himself, and in both I was successful. A bill had

* The principal facts above stated have been likewise given by Dr. Miller, in his "Examination of the Charters and Statutes of Trinity College, Dublin," p. 52. Dublin, 1804. This is a very able pamphlet, and one to which Dr. Todd, the author of the "Historical Introduction" ("Dublin University Calendar," 1833), acknowledges his deep obligations.

been brought into the Irish House of Commons [proposed or seconded, we believe, by the present Duke of Wellington], to gratify the Roman Catholics in several particulars, of which the principal one was a grant of the elective franchise. Among the others was a provision for enabling them to graduate in the University, in which they had been for some time received for education, though not permitted to graduate. Against this provision the Senior Fellows prepared a petition, to be given in the same evening, as the bill was then to be introduced. The Junior Fellows were summoned to the chamber of the Vice-Provost, Dr. Murray, and asked whether they would add their signatures. Some of us having expressed a wish to enter into a discussion of the business, we were drily told that we were required only to choose whether we would sign the petition or not. This treatment seemed to me so cavalier, for a business in which we had as much right to form an opinion as the Seniors, that I told the Juniors that if they came to my chambers, we could prepare a petition for ourselves. So many concurred with me, that we had forthwith a counter-petition, subscribed by eleven Fellows—the half of the body as it was then composed. The result was that neither petition was presented, and the clause remained in the bill.

"This clause, when enacted, gave occasion to the contest with the Vice-Chancellor, which followed. There were two difficulties to be removed out of the way of the Roman Catholics—one was a declaration against Popery prescribed by act of parliament; the other, an oath prescribed by the statutes of the University. The former alone was removed by the bill in a conditional clause, supposing that the King would himself make a corresponding change in the statutes. But though the claim was conditional, the enactment was positive; for it ordained, that after the 1st day of June it should not be lawful to require the declaration.

"I was, by my standing, to hold at the ensuing Commencement the office of Senior Non-Regent, which, in our University, is always held by the Senior Master of Arts among the Fellows present, who had not taken a higher degree. He is understood to represent the body of the Masters of Arts in conferring degrees, in which he has for the day a co-ordinate negative with the Vice-Chancellor and the Provost. The

office had, however, become a mere form, if it ever had been more; and the person, to whose turn it fell, did no more than take his seat in an old oaken chair, in which he remained during the time of the Commencement.

"In the interval between the enactment of the law and the Commencement, no change had been made in the statute; so that the oath remained, though the declaration had been abrogated. It was, however, expected that some Roman Catholics would present themselves for degrees, and that there would be some discussion, or at least embarrassment. To this expectation I had not turned my mind; for though I never shrunk from a struggle, I never sought one.* However, in the evening preceding the Commencement, Stokes called to propose to me, I suppose, as the future Senior Non-Regent, some plan of proceeding for carrying into effect the intention of the act, to which it was known that the Vice-Chancellor was adverse. What this plan was I do not remember, having at the time rejected it as impracticable or unavailing. But it occurred to me that I might, by exercising the latent and forgotten authority of Senior Non-Regent, at least inhibit the declaration, which had been positively repealed. This accordingly I determined to do, if it should be proposed the next day.

"Our University statutes, however questionable their authority, must regulate the conduct of those who act under them. By these I saw it was required that the Senior Non-Regent should be elected by the Senatus Academicus. This had not been done within the memory of any one of us; but it was important to stand upon sure ground, and I determined to be elected. When, therefore, the Proctor told me to go and sit in the chair of the Senior Non-Regent, I replied that I had not been elected. The Vice-Chancellor, who had, perhaps, come in a state of excitement, became angry, and said that he had not come to be taught points of law. Recourse was had to the statutes, and it was found that an election was directed. The Proctor accordingly went round, as in supplicating for a degree, and my election was reported by a *placet omnibus*. I took my seat, and

* This disposition was in strict accordance with the advice which he had long before received from his father—"Do not be quarrelsome; but never take a blow." What was the result? "I had no enmities."

prepared for the issue; and the Vice-Chancellor soon discovered that, without intending it, he had come to be taught points of law.

"It was my feeling that, if I could enforce the act as far as it went, the remainder would follow as a necessary consequence. I knew that I could not hinder the administration of the oath, no change having been made in the statute. The Vice-Chancellor, however, in his impatience, did not suffer the Proctor to proceed with the supplications for degrees, but chose to begin with the oath, that it might be seen who of the candidates would make any difficulty, though it was not theoretically certain that all, who should thus have sworn in the first instance, would afterwards obtain the degree for which they had so qualified. I suffered the oath to be administered to all the candidates; but when the Proctor was proceeding, as usual, to recite the declaration, I interposed, and addressing the Vice-Chancellor, told him that it appeared to me that the declaration had been abrogated; and that, if required, I would, by the authority vested in me as Senior Non-Regent, suspend the *comitia*. I should have said that I would refuse my consent to every degree at the Commencement, by which I could have suspended it in effect.

"Great was the confusion in the Hall, and no one knew what it was about, except the few immediately round the table, to which I had advanced from the old chair. I had communicated my intention only to Stokes in the preceding evening, and to my former tutor, Dr. Young, just before the Commencement, the latter having distinguished himself for knowledge of collegiate law, by his exposure of the weakness of the claim of the Provost to the right of negativing the resolution of a majority of the Senior Fellows. Nor had I time for doing more, as I was to set out the following morning on a journey to Killarney, and on that account had ridden to Lucan the morning of the Commencement, to visit my mother before I started.

"When I had told the Vice-Chancellor that I would suspend the Commencement, he replied, 'And I, by the authority vested in me as Vice-Chancellor, adjourn the Commencement to next Friday;' but instead of rising and quitting the Hall, he continued to sit as not knowing what to do. It

happened that Wolfe had attended for the purpose of taking a degree as Doctor of Laws, probably as some sort of qualification for the office of Provost, to which he was then aspiring. The Vice-Chancellor, after a short pause, called him to him for consultation. Inquiry having been made for the act of parliament, I produced a copy which I had in my pocket; and, on examination, it was perceived that the clause, however conditional in its preamble, was peremptory in its enactment. The Commencement, then, notwithstanding the suspension, proceeded, the declaration being omitted as the act required. From that time Roman Catholics have freely graduated amongst us; and surely this was most desirable, whatever diversity of opinion may prevail in regard to the question of admitting them to political power."

About the same time, he was by circumstances involved in a struggle with the students (and since many may remember it, we shall give a brief statement of facts), which ended, much to his regret, though perhaps advantageously, in the suppression of the Historical Society.* He was Junior Dean, and as such was charged with the care of the discipline of the University. By some chance, in an evening during the long vacation, he was walking across the Library-square, when his attention was attracted by the unusual appearance of a hackney-coach, out of which three young persons, whom he knew, and two females, went into one of the buildings. The men were occupying chambers in the absence of the owners. This occurrence he, of course, reported to the next Board, and an order was made excluding them from the College. Here he thought the matter would have ended. But in the following winter, happening to go to one of the meetings of the Historical Society, he there saw one of the three offenders, who had been banished by the Board. He went over to him, and reminding him of the order, desired him to withdraw which he immediately did. He had, however, previously made application to the auditor, and then to the chairman; and when each had declined to interfere, he went himself to the offender. Soon afterwards he left the meeting. The next morning he was informed that the Society had taken his conduct into consi-

* It has been revived within the last few years, and, being placed under very wise restrictions, is much more likely to effect its purpose.

deration after his departure, and had appointed an extraordinary meeting to be held at two o'clock on the following day. It would, perhaps, have been wiser, as he himself has allowed, to have waited for the result of this meeting; but thinking their conduct contumacious in even convening a meeting for the formal consideration of the conduct of the Junior Dean in the discharge of his office, he reported the matter to the Board, and the struggle began. The Board was already sensible of the expediency of having a control over an association, which had begun to assume much of an independent character. They accordingly at once determined to require of the Society, that it should submit to certain specified regulations. These were rejected in a high spirit of independence. The room allowed by the Board for the meetings was, in consequence, closed against them; and a secession, with the future Chief Justice Bushe at its head, was then made to the public rooms in William-street. This spirit of insubordination had arisen among them, chiefly because men like him, who were no longer subject to collegiate control, had been permitted to continue members of a collegiate society.

Having, some time previously, travelled through a great part of England with the late Dr. Burrowes (latterly Dean of Cork), and made his acquaintance with Sir Joshua Reynolds and other distinguished characters, Mr. (now Dr.) Miller married in the summer of 1794, there being no statute prohibiting the marriage of Fellows. Let us again have recourse to his "Reminiscences":—

"From this time I became more settled in my habits, and more diligent in my studies. I had not, however, as yet, discovered a subject which much interested me, except so far as my profession directed my attention to theological reading. Though I had been rather distinguished by my answering in mathematics, I felt no disposition to devote my life to purely mathematical learning. I attended a course of chemistry, but found that, for want of a habit of manipulation, I never could be a chemist. To mechanical philosophy I would gladly have given my attention, and I became a candidate for the professorship when vacant; but in this pursuit I was defeated by the competition of Dr. Elrington. I was then made assistant to the Professor of

Oratory, to which I had some pretensions; but Graves, having been chosen Professor when Dr. Kearney was made Provost, I relinquished my assistantship, and was removed [in 1799] to that of History, in which I settled myself, having found an object which has chiefly employed my thoughts during the remainder of my life. Dr. Kearney, who, though himself indolent, was fond of encouraging the exertions of others, urged me to this course by the example of his brother, Dr. Michael Kearney, who had gained lasting character by a course of only four lectures on the history of Rome.* He, indeed, had been Professor, and I was only assistant; but the actual Professor [Dr. Hodgkinson] did nothing, and so the field was open for me. I resolved to undertake a course embracing the whole of modern history, taking upon me to read prelections, which should have been read by my principal. It is true, I was not much conversant with modern history; but having read and studied Priestley's 'Lectures,' I was not unprepared for a philosophical consideration of such materials as I could collect. . . . I shall here only specify the circumstances attending the execution of my plan. One year I gave up to general preparation, and then began to read prelections, six or eight in each year, as I could prepare them, giving notice at each of the time and subject of the next.

"In this manner I struggled four years, though greatly overworked; for, besides my duties as a public tutor, I had other necessary engagements, and was also one of the constant preachers in the College Chapel.† Being thus oppressed with labour, and yet deeply interested in my plan of historical lectures, I determined, in the summer of 1804, to accept a living in the patronage of the College, then vacant [the parish of Derryvullen, in the diocese of Clogher, which he held till his death], that I might at least continue my work as a book, if I could not prevail to be continued as a lecturer. This latter part of the arrangement Dr. Kearney, then Provost, managed for me with the Board;

* "Lectures concerning History, read during the year 1775, in Trinity College." Dublin, 1776. pp. 56.

† In 1796 he had been elected Donnelan Lecturer. He chose for his subject "An Inquiry into the Causes that have impeded the further progress of Christianity;" but the sermons have not been published.

and it was determined that I should receive an annual payment of £100, the customary salary of a Professor, until I should have completed my course.

"In the preceding period of my lecturing, I collected a moderate audience [seldom exceeding ten persons] in the Law School [his friend, Alexander Knox, being always one], sufficient to encourage me, or least to permit me, to persevere, but not to animate my exertions by publicity.* But as I was approaching the sixteenth century, the number of my hearers increased so much, that I was encouraged to remove to the Examination Hall, from which time my lectures attracted a large portion of public attention, strangers forming a considerable portion of the auditory. In this manner was my course prosecuted, to its termination, about Easter 1811. Much still remained to be done before the lectures could be fitted for publication; and, with my utmost exertion, I could only publish a first and second of eight octavo volumes in the year 1816, after which the remaining volumes appeared in pairs, at intervals of two or three years."

It does not come within our plan to give a regular review of this most able work, which "possesses a unity of subject, harmony of proportion, and connexion of parts, that render it not merely the best modern history in our language, but the only one from which a student can obtain a systematic view of the progress of civilization."† But even in this general sketch of the author's life, we must take something more than a mere passing notice of the condensed wisdom and research of nearly fifty years of learning, directed to the noblest purposes of which learning is capable; for though his work perhaps contains some views,

* It is worthy of remark that Dr. Sullivan's "Lectures on the Constitution and Laws of England," which have since deservedly acquired so much fame, were delivered in presence of only *three* individuals—Dr. Michael Kearney and two others. Surely no great encouragement to Irish genius! In fact, the Irish long seemed Unconscious of the merits of two considerable works by sons of their own university—Hamilton's "Conic Sections" and "Sullivan's Lectures;" and hesitated to praise, until the incense of fame arose to one from the literary altars of Cambridge, and an English judge, Sir William Blackstone, authorized the other.

† "Foreign Quarterly Review."

which, to untheoretical minds, appear fanciful, it confessedly abounds with ingenious disquisition, and displays at once learning, research, and luminous arrangement, clothed at the same time with an engaging elegance of style. Agreeably to the suggestion of Mr. Murray, of London, the eight were reduced to four octavo volumes, in which form a second edition was published in 1832, with such improvements as had been suggested by more recent publications. And now a third, and much-improved edition has appeared, the correction of which employed the author to within a week of his death. It is much to be regretted that he was not allowed the pleasure of seeing the desired publication of what had cost him so much labour and anxiety; but his task was done. He was enabled thankfully to record this interesting fact:—

"I now dismiss, in a form as correct as I have had power to give to it, a work by which I have hoped to render more lasting service to mankind, by furnishing them with a more distinct apprehension of the moral government of God."

In the preface we have the following slight sketch of the way in which the theory dawned upon his mind:—

"In looking through those compendiums of general history which, he thought, might best furnish a plan of orderly connexion, he consulted Puffendorf's 'Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe;' and in perusing this work of a Protestant writer, he was particularly struck by the representation of the spiritual monarchy of Rome, which is very minutely detailed. By this he was led to consider the papacy more distinctly than he had ever done before, as arising naturally out of the earlier condition of modern Europe, and intimately affecting all the relations of the states, which were gradually formed from the ruins of the ancient empire of the West. Here he seemed to have found a principle of real connexion, and not merely of orderly arrangement. He called to mind that he had learned to consider communities as moral instruments of the providence of God, and the consideration of the use and influence of a state of a peculiar character, intimately connected with the rest, appeared to supply a principle of unity, by which some plan of providential government might perhaps be discovered, which should

vindicate its truth by its manifest tendency to advance the improvement of mankind. The papacy, which he had been accustomed to consider as an abuse and an evil, might be admitted as furnishing the connecting principle, since he had learned to consider war itself as beneficial, and even as the proper agency, by which one community influences another."—p. iv.

This was, however, but the centre of the circle. The states forming the circumference were still to be examined. France, in all ages formidable, restless, and pregnant with mighty influences on the general commonwealth of civilization, demanded a large share of his study. The reciprocal influences of this great empire, of Germany, and of Italy, opened some admirable results. But here, again, we shall allow the author to speak for himself:—

"In studying the application of the notion of Mably, the history of the two important treaties of Westphalia and Utrecht came to be examined, the former having mainly adjusted the political relations of Europe in the seventeenth, the latter in the eighteenth century. In this examination two observations presented themselves, by which the plan was at length completely formed. It soon appeared that the adjustments effected by these two treaties were different; the former having constituted Austria the predominant, and France the opposing power; the latter having placed France in the position of Austria, and Great Britain in that of France. It accordingly occurred to the author, that there were two distinct periods in the arrangement of a balance of power, the Austrian and the French, and that the former was but preparatory to the latter. The other observation was, that, though almost all the powers of Europe were concerned in the negotiations of Westphalia, the northern governments were not included in those of Utrecht, and that their interests were separately adjusted, first by the treaty of Oliva, and then by that of Nystadt. It then occurred that, in the progressive formation of the system of Europe, it had resolved itself into two combinations of states, a principal one maintaining a balance of power among its component governments, and an accessory composed of the four governments of Russia, Poland, Denmark, and Sweden, having for its object the aggrandisement of the first of these

countries The plan of the theory was then completed. All which was afterwards to be done, was to fill up the outline."—p. v.

It was in this spirit, of following the lights which great events have thrown from time to time on the steps of Providence, that Dr. Miller composed his "Philosophy of Modern History." Examining the progress of every leading nation in Europe, from its first formation, through all the vicissitudes of wealth and poverty, of triumph and decay, and developing the causes of their several catastrophes, he views them in combination, and elucidates the general principles of the European commonwealth, by their reciprocal actions and impressions. He thus supplies the student and philosopher with materials for thinking, collected on the widest scale of human affairs, and at once embracing the most interesting topics, and filling the mind with the safest and most ennobling contemplations. One constant characteristic of the work ought to give it a ten-fold value to every man who feels, that homage to the divine wisdom is the highest wisdom of man. It is written throughout in a truly religious spirit; since in every page we find an abiding sense of the divine superintendence, which hallows the subject—a deep, yet unsuperstitious devotion, which guides the writer through the obliquities and impurities of human actions unstained—and a manly zeal for the vindication of the great principles of moral truth, which alone can render history what it was intended to be, a beacon to mankind. In fact, what Montesquieu did for the laws of Europe, Dr. Miller has done for its history. We know of no text-book which is more essential to the college-lecturer; no general view of facts, which can prove more valuable to the student; and no elucidation of the ways of Providence, which ought to be more gladly welcomed by the Christian.

In the winter of 1817, Dr. Miller was induced to apply for the head-mastership of the Royal School of Armagh, which was immediately conferred upon him by the late Primate Stuart. This new appointment necessarily subjected him to a heavy appropriation of his time; and important as the post undoubtedly was, such a man was misplaced in such a situation. It was like leaving one (as Swift has somewhere observed) to make pens with a razor. Oh!

blush, ye dispensers of the loaves and fishes. He had achieved a name which would have raised him to the summit of his profession in any other country than Ireland. Nevertheless, he complained not of the treatment that he received. Passed by many an inferior claimant for public reward, and left by those who had the power to raise him in a position far below what he deserved, he was as zealous in the cause of his Church as if he had been elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. He never thought of self, but acted solely from a sense of duty. We, however, must express what we feel in such a case. We see many an inferior man, with whom it would have been humiliation to compare him, in the possession of professional honours and emoluments far greater than what he enjoyed: but—

> "Ah! who can tell how hard it is to climb
> The steep, where Fame's proud temple shines afar;
> Ah! who can tell how many a soul sublime
> Has waged with Fortune an unequal war!"

It would be wrong not to notice, however briefly, the noble stand which he made, in conjunction with so many able champions of Protestantism, against that fatal policy of statesmen, by which Roman Catholics were admitted, in the year 1829, to political power. He was, at this advanced period of his life, much better acquainted with the real character and workings of Popery, than he had been in 1793, when he hailed with pleasure the commencement of concessions, and gave them, as we have seen, a helping hand; and he hesitated not to stand forth, and boldly give utterance to words of wisdom and experience. This conduct may, indeed, have damaged his prospects, so far as regarded his profession; but he was a man who never for a single moment looked to consequences. He spake and wrote exactly what he felt to be required. He thus had the happy privilege of possessing an approving conscience; and though his children's children may not see the end of the mischief which a spirit of miscalled liberality has occasioned, they certainly will not have to blame him for not raising, before it was too late, the voice of warning.*

* His "Letter to Mr. (now Lord) Plunket on the policy of the Roman Catholic Question" (London, 1826), is a fair index to his opinions.

Nor can we pass on to the closing scene of his life, without taking due notice of his well-known replies to Dr. Pusey.* And here again we can avail ourselves of his interesting "Reminiscences":—

"Alexander Knox, who took a very lively interest in my lectures on history, once said to me, that he wished I might be so pious as to be qualified for the reward, to which that work might entitle me. The secret principle of his wish has latterly been developed in its influence on the Church, by generating that extreme party of the high-church clergy, of which Mr. Newman and Professor Pusey, both of Oxford, have been most conspicuous. He appears to have been bred in the Established Church, of which he always professed to be an attached member; but his religious opinions were strongly influenced by an early acquaintance and continued correspondence with Wesley; and latterly to this modification of his sentiments was added, whether from a political connexion with Lord Castlereagh, to whom, for a short time, he was Under-Secretary, or, perhaps, from a dislike of religious dissent, a disposition to look favourably on the Church of Rome, and to hope for a reconciliation between the two Churches. Of this disposition he once gave me a remarkable proof. Knowing his great influence with the late Archbishop Broderick, I solicited him to procure a curacy for Mr. ——, a reformed Romanist priest, of good character and ability. He resisted my application, assigning as his reason, that he did not wish that a good man should leave that Church. At another time, too, he gave me to understand that, in his opinion, much might be said for transubstantiation.

"As my mind was, during our intercourse, engrossed by my 'Philosophy of Modern History,' which constituted the bond of intimacy between us, and was, of course, the main subject of our conversations, I did not much attend to his religious peculiarities, though he once induced me to go with him to a conventicle, to hear Dr. Coke, the successor of

* "A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Pusey, in reference to his Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford," London, 1840; and "A Second Letter to the Rev. Dr. Pusey, in reference to his Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf," London, 1841. See, also, some letters on the same subject in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal," vol. i.

Wesley, address an assemblage of Methodist ministers. Latterly, however, they have been recalled to my mind by the controversy in which I became engaged with Professor Pusey.

"The party with which he is connected had, during, I think, about six years, published a series of short, anonymous treatises, denominated, 'Tracts for the Times,' in which their principles were propounded, moderately and cautiously at first, but gradually with increasing distinctness. In the course of these publications Professor Pusey addressed, with his name, a letter of apology to the Bishop of Oxford, as his ecclesiastical superior. This letter I had an opportunity of reading early in the winter of 1839. I found many things in it which I disapproved, and made them the subject of some remarks in conversation with my friends; and finding that it was urged, in reply to me, that it had not received any answer, I determined that I would at least put an end to that argument, by publishing an answer, and addressing it to the Professor. Accordingly, in the vacation at Christmas, I wrote a part of my intended answer; but, being soon engaged in preparing a judgment for the Consistorial Court, in which I proposed to establish the illegality of marriages celebrated by Presbyterian ministers, in which persons of the Established Church were concerned as parties, my answer remained unfinished to the month of October following, when it came most seasonably to my relief—my mind at that time sinking under accumulated sorrow. Nothing but the effort which this excited could, humanly speaking, have roused me from my grief.

"Whether it was that the party found themselves pressed by this first reply or not, a tract, No. XC., was published by them in the spring of 1841, which so explicitly stated objectionable tenets, that the writer was, by a number of the Tutors of Oxford, called forward to declare his name. It was avowed by Mr. Newman, and the publication of anonymous tracts came to an end. About this time Professor Pusey published a letter of explanation, addressed to Dr. Jelf, of Christ Church, but a man of moderate opinions, and though professing to be a high-churchman, not at all inclined to the extravagances of the new party. Professor Sewell, of Oxford, also, who had visited Ireland, published

a letter in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, and in the *Oxford Herald*, animadverting very sharply on the general ignorance of the Irish clergy, and urging to me some considerations, which, he conceived, should hinder me from contending against the tenets of his friend, Professor Pusey. To this letter I replied in the same journal, refuting, as I conceived, the consideration which he had urged, and inviting him to a full and fair discussion of the subject. From the discussion he shrunk, alleging that he was not a member of the party; and when three letters had been published on each side, our correspondence ceased.* . . .

"My 'Second Letter to Professor Pusey' was accordingly published in the winter of 1841. To this, as in the former case, he made no public reply, nor had I with him any second interview. A little sequel of the controversy, however, occurred in the following summer, when Mr. Palmer inserted a letter in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, complaining that I had represented him as having, with Professor Pusey, maintained that there is still a spiritual relation existing between our Church and the See of Rome. To this letter I replied, stating my reasons. In a second letter, Mr. Palmer pleaded that he had referred only to the statutes of 1532 and 1533, which cut off several abuses of that see, and did not allude at all to anything done many years afterwards by the Convocation. I then replied that the Convocation, in those discussions, was not employed on the question of the separation from Rome, but on the interior regulation of our own Church, in preparing its liturgy and articles, the separation having been effected by the statute of supremacy in 1534, the year next following those in which the statutes to which he referred had been enacted: so that it appeared that when these had cut the cords by which the supremacy of Rome was maintained, the separation followed as a matter of course."

It is unnecessary for us† to speak, at any length, in praise of Dr. Miller's uncompromising defence of scriptural education in Ireland, inasmuch as we have not long since re-

* In the summer of 1841, Dr. Miller had an interview with Dr. Pusey, near Dublin, and has left a sketch of their conversation; but for obvious reasons we do not give it.

† "Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine."

viewed rather fully (in Nos. 52 and 54) his two admirable replies to Drs. Elrington and Taylor.* We may therefore dismiss the subject in a few words.

Already, when occasion required, he had promptly come forward (in 1825, by the publication of his "Observations on the Doctrines of Christianity, and on the Athanasian Creed,") as a champion of our Church against Arian opinions. He had also protested boldly against what is called a liberal policy, when that policy was carried, as he believed, to an alarming extent; he had become the formidable opponent of Dr. Pusey and party; he was, as we shall see, *the* authority in Ireland upon matters of ecclesiastical law and discipline; and yet, when peace and quietness would have been desirable, after a long and well-spent life in the cause of religion and literature, he was as ready as ever to buckle on his armour, and (as was aptly remarked at that time) was found, like old Entellus in the Æneid, to have retained sufficient vigour for the struggle. Only a day or two before his death he thus expressed himself with energy—"I have been engaged in many a struggle, and in them all I have done my best; but I can look back with the greatest pleasure upon what I have endeavoured to do for the Church Education Society. *Stand by it!*" Which side had the best of the argument no one needs to ask. We shall merely give the concluding paragraph of his "Present Crisis of the Church of Ireland Considered" (Dublin, 1844), in which he so forcibly addressed the Prime Minister of the day:—

"Whatever difficulties in the management of the public business may have been thrown in your way by the agitations of Ireland, this empire is too great, and looks forward to too high destinies, to be governed by a mere compromise of contending parties. Its government can be securely directed only by great and acknowledged principles of action, steadily and fearlessly maintained, through the various difficulties to which it must be from time to time exposed; and, above all, it should be influenced and controlled by a prevailing sense of religious obligation, as in all transactions paramount to every consideration of merely human policy.

* "The Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland Argued, in reply to Dr. Elrington," London, 1847; and "Supplement to the Case of the Church Education Society Argued." Dublin, 1847.

Return, then, I beseech you, to the genuine principles of the constitution, in all its main ordinances essentially Protestant. In adhering to it, you will find a more sure relief from your Irish embarrassments, because you will act in harmony with the principles of the general government, which you have undertaken to conduct. This is the course of true wisdom, not the policy of a temporary and delusive expediency; and 'all her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.'"

Before we conclude, we must acknowledge the deep obligations under which we all lie to the late Vicar-General of Armagh, as the expounder and vindicator of our civil and ecclesiastical laws. On more than one important occasion did he appear in that capacity—at first as Principal Surrogate, and latterly, since the death of the Right Hon. Dr. Radcliff, in 1843, as Vicar-General; and both the strength and vigour of his judgment, and the extent and accuracy of his knowledge, were always most strikingly displayed. Of the many able judgments which he delivered in the Consistorial Court, and which, from time to time, appeared in print, the most important one was that in the case of "Lemon *v.* Lemon," since it involved the question of the law of marriage in Ireland.* It was a question which the most eminent lawyers and judges admitted to be involved in the greatest obscurity and difficulty, more especially at the present day, when the learning on the subject has (to use the language of Chief Justice Tindal) "become almost a dead letter in our courts." But to prosecute such an inquiry with success, requiring patient investigation, much learning, and no ordinary powers of reasoning, Dr. Miller was pre-eminently qualified; and having entered the lists with two of the ablest lawyers in England, he proved himself fully equal to sustain the conflict.† And it is not many weeks since he published a pamphlet on "The Law of Ecclesiastical Residences in Ireland," which has been written with as much clearness, precision, and ability, as if he had not passed the bright meridian of life. It certainly is a most

* "Judgment in the Consistorial Court of Armagh, involving the question of the Law of Marriage in Ireland," Armagh, 1840.

† See his "Notes on the Opinions of Lord Brougham and Vaux, and Lord Campbell, in the case of the Queen v. Millis (Writ of Error)," London, 1844.

remarkable specimen of what a man could do when he had almost completed his eighty-fourth year.

We have now arrived at the peaceful close of a patriarch's life; which, as he has himself observed, had been upon the whole very happy. For some time past he had been failing in body; but his mind continued to be as clear and vigorous as ever. "I am now restored," he said, "to my usual state of health, and a better one, I thank God, than I could now reasonably expect." Blessed with a temper of mind peculiarly cheerful, contented, and happy, he preserved it unimpaired to the end. In society, even in his declining years, his exhaustless stores of anecdote rendered him the most agreeable of companions; and in the devoted attachment of his numerous family which surrounded him, he experienced his greatest earthly happiness and enjoyment. But the improvement in his health was of very brief duration. Finding that his strength was rapidly declining, he, not many weeks before his decease, tendered his resignation of the office of Head Master of the Royal School of Armagh, which he had held for the long period of thirty-one years; and then, freed from all anxiety and care, and, through the divine mercy, being free also from bodily pain and suffering, he quietly awaited the stroke of death; and on the morning of the 6th of October breathed his last, so gently, that the moment of his departure could scarcely be ascertained. Most applicable, indeed, to his case are the lines of an old poet, Sir John Beaumont:—

> "Why should vain sorrow follow him with tears,
> Who shakes off burdens of declining years?
> Whose thread exceeds the usual bounds of life,
> And feels no stroke of any fatal knife?"

He had (what we may call) two worldly wishes—that he might be spared the sufferings of a lingering death, and that his body might not outlive his intellect; and God mercifully granted what he desired. "Sincerely honoured and revered by an unusually large circle of friends, he has 'come to his grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in in his season'"

Besides the many works which have been already enumerated, Dr. Miller published the following:—"Dionysii Longini de Sublimitate Commentarius, Græce et Latine," 1797

and 1820; "Elements of Natural Philosophy," 1799; "Letter on the Manner in which Christianity was Taught by our Saviour and his Apostles," 1822; "The Athanasian Creed, with Explanatory Observations," 1826; "The Temptations of Jesus Christ in the Wilderness Explained as symbolically representing the Trials of the Christian Church," 1826; "Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, as maintained in the Church of Rome," 1826; "The Question of the Change of the Sabbath Examined, in reference to the Jewish Scriptures, for obviating the Inferences both of Jews and of Roman Catholics," 1828; "The Change of the Sabbath, and the Institution of the Eucharist, Illustrated from the Jewish Scriptures," 1829; "Examination of the Act to amend the Representation of the People of Ireland, in its Relation to the University of Dublin," 1832; and "Principal Events of Modern History, with their Times, in reference to 'Modern History Philosophically Illustrated,'" 1839. He was likewise author of several sermons on public occasions, 1794—1803; of three essays in the "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," 1793—1799; of a "Memoir of the Irish Reformation of 1826 and 1827," in the *British Critic* for January, 1828; of "Considerations on the Law of Divorce," in *Blackwood's Magazine* for November, 1829; of several articles in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, 1840—1846; of articles in the *British Magazine*, 1845 and 1846 (reprinted); and of various contributions to other periodicals.

Postscript.—Since the foregoing sketch was written, our attention has been drawn by a friend to a very interesting and important letter from Dr. Miller, which has appeared for the first time in the lately published "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh, second Marquess of Londonderry," vol. ii., p. 302. It is dated 11th May, 1799; and the writer, alluding to the plan of a College proposed to be founded by the Government at Armagh, gives what would appear to be, in his opinion, the best system of academical education. There are, we understand, some unpublished letters from Hannah More, Alexander Knox, and other distinguished characters, with whom Dr. Miller was in the habit of corresponding. We need scarcely say that to any letters of such persons a considerable degree of interest must be attached.

MODERN HISTORY.

BOOK IV.

MODERN HISTORY, FROM THE BRITISH REVOLUTION IN THE YEAR 1688 TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION IN THE YEAR 1789.

CHAPTER I.

Of the history of France, from the first grand alliance in the year 1689 *to the commencement of the reign of Louis XV. in the year* 1715.

The peace of Ryswick, 1697—The war of the Spanish succession, and the second grand alliance, 1701—The peace of Utrecht, 1713—Literary character of the reign of Louis XIV.—Art of war improved.

In the war of the grand alliance, concluded in the year 1689, the king of France, being compelled to withdraw his troops from the empire, perpetrated that work of desolation in the Palatinate and the neighbouring districts, which inflamed to its utmost violence the animosity of his enemies. As he could not from so much devastation derive to himself any real advantage, it the more exasperated the adverse governments, especially the protestant states, which sympathised more warmly with the people of the Palatinate. The persecution of the Protestants of France had before excited the commiseration of those, who in other countries professed the same religion. The cruel and wanton destruction of a whole territory belonging to German Protestants, served at this time to render the feeling of indignant compassion more intense.

The war was waged over a wide and various theatre; on the Rhine, in Italy, in Spain, in the Netherlands, in Ire-

land, on the sea, and on the land. The Netherlands however were the principal scene of action, and there France maintained the superiority of her arms against all the exertions of the combined powers. Louis however at length, notwithstanding his advantages, perceived that a peace was important to his interest, because the death of the king of Spain appeared to be not far distant, and it was desirable that the grand alliance should have been dissolved, before he should claim the succession of the Spanish crown. Negotiations were accordingly commenced in the year 1696, by which in the following year was concluded the peace of Ryswick.

The treaty of Ryswick may be considered as having constituted the new system of federative policy, which had been commenced by the first grand alliance. It is admitted that no considerable acquisition was made by any of the contending powers, so that the general state of Europe remained apparently the same, as it had been before the war. Sufficient advantage was however obtained for the general interest of Europe, because that which was needed, was not a transference of territory, but the security and permanence of the existing relations. The territories of Spain, of the empire, and of the Dutch republic, were protected against the encroachment of French ambition, and the resources of France were so exhausted in the struggle, that her power was reduced in a due proportion to the general system. William was at the same time formally acknowledged king of Great Britain; the same treaty, which constituted the new system of European policy, ascertaining also the security of the new arrangement of the British government, which consummated the domestic policy of these countries.

Some subordinate arrangements remained however after this treaty, which were necessary for completing the new order of Europe. In these the later part of this important reign was employed, as the earlier activity of Louis had eventually determined the relative situation of the two principal governments. The disposal of the dominions of Spain was at this time the object of contention. In the Austrian period of the policy of Europe these dominions had added strength to the empire, first by a direct connexion under a common sovereign, and afterwards by the friendly correspondence of the two branches of the Austrian family. That

period had reached its termination. France at this time occupied the position which had been held by Austria, and it had accordingly become necessary, that some new arrangement should be made in regard to those territories, which had previously enhanced the importance of the empire.

Of the European territories of the Spanish government it is in this view necessary to consider only those of the peninsula and of the Netherlands, the Italian dependencies having in the exhausted state of Italy no other importance, than as they served to maintain the interior balance of that country. The dependencies in the other regions of the earth followed the fortune of the peninsular territory. The territories in the peninsula and in the Netherlands, we accordingly find, underwent changes corresponding to the change effected in the political system of Europe. By the war of the Spanish succession the crown of Spain was transferred from the family of Austria to that of Bourbon; and the Spanish Netherlands, detached from Spain, were transferred to the empire, but under the condition of constituting a barrier, for protecting the independence of the Dutch republic. The one arrangement added some strength to the predominant power of the new system of policy, the other established a connexion between the house of Austria and the two maritime governments, for resisting and balancing its force.

To these two portions of the Spanish territories, Louis advanced distinct pretensions at different times; to the Netherlands, as has been already stated, in the year 1667, and to the crown of Spain itself in the year 1700. It was most important to the result, that the claim of the Netherlands should so long have preceded the other, because it prepared the confederacy, by which Louis was afterwards opposed. If the French king had by different circumstances been tempted to begin the enterprises of his ambition with the pretension to the crown of Spain, his attempt would doubtless have excited much alarm among the other governments of Europe, but a well-combined plan of operations among independent states, of various and often conflicting interests, requires the concurrence of so many favourable agencies, that it cannot be imagined, that the mere alarm caused by such an enterprise, however great,

would have been sufficient to bring it at once into existence in so much vigour, as to be adequate to the struggle. The settlement of Europe would have been abandoned to ill-concerted efforts, destitute of combination in the direction of hostilities, and of a predominating and controlling influence in the negotiations, by which they should be terminated.

In the order, in which these enterprises actually occurred, every thing was in its place. The first effort of the ambition of Louis was directed towards countries bordering on the Dutch republic, the government instrumental in transferring to Britain the continental relations of the secondary power in the general system. When that government had nearly sunk under the violence of the storm, which soon extended its ravages beyond the Spanish Netherlands, and had been saved rather by the indiscretion of the invader, than by its own desperate resolution, it received a seasonable admonition to provide better for its future security. The restless ambition of Louis, in urging claims of re-union, maintained during the succeeding peace the alarm previously excited by his hostility, and the league of Augsburg began the combinations, which were three years afterwards completed in the grand alliance. When the peace of Ryswick, which was the result of that alliance, had constituted the principal arrangement of the new order of policy, by placing the British government at the head of a confederacy opposed to the power of France, the latter might then proceed to acquire an influence over the councils of Spain, by advancing one of its princes to the vacant throne of that country. A systematic combination had then been formed, by which this extension of the influence might be so far counteracted, as to render it consistent with the general equilibrium.

This order of events, which appears to have been thus important, grew out of the domestic circumstances of the royal family of Spain, the claim to the Netherlands having arisen from the second marriage of the king of Spain, and therefore in his lifetime, and the claim to the crown itself from his son's want of children and of brothers. On these contingencies the whole arrangement of European policy appears to have depended, the one leading to the peace of Ryswick, the other to that of Utrecht, and both in the order, in which the one treaty was preparatory to the other.

The negotiations, which preceded the war of the Spanish succession, though in their result they contributed to the settlement of the interests of Europe, were yet a glaring exemplification of that spurious anxiety for the preservation of the balance of power, which absurdly seeks in schemes of unprovoked and unwarrantable aggression the security of national independence. It is however consolatory to reflect, that neither of the two treaties of partition[1], negotiated on this occasion, was carried into execution. The earlier one was frustrated by the death of the elector of Bavaria, for whom the mutual jealousy of France and England had destined the principal portion of the spoils of Spain. The second had no other operation, than to determine the declining sovereign of that country to bequeath to a French prince the whole of his dominions, as the only method of preserving them from the proposed dismemberment. The king of Spain had naturally been disposed to favour the pretensions of the Austrian family, to which he belonged; but the emperor was unable to send into the peninsula a force sufficient to support the nomination of his younger son, and the anxiety of the Spanish monarch to maintain the integrity of his dominions, prevailed over his concern for his family.

Though Louis had concluded with William two successive treaties for the partition of the dominions of Spain, he could not determine to relinquish the splendid prize, which the will of Charles II. of that country presented to his ambition. Accordingly, exhausted as were the resources of his kingdom by the war concluded only three years before, he resolved to assert by arms the claim, which this bequest had vested in Philip, the second son of the dauphin. The emperor on the other hand contended for a right of inheritance in behalf of his second son, the Archduke Charles. As in the year pre-

[1] The earlier of these treaties, concluded in the year 1698, assigned to the dauphin the kingdom of the two Sicilies, with the ports of Tuscany, the marquisate of Final, and the province of Guipuscoa; to the archduke Charles the duchy of Milan; and to the electoral prince of Bavaria the remainder of the Spanish monarchy. The later, concluded in the year 1700, assigned to the dauphin the duchy of Loraine in addition to the territories assigned by the former, the duke of Lorraine being compensated by a grant of the duchy of Milan; and ceded all the remainder of the Spanish monarchy to the archduke.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 255, 256.

ceding the death of the king of Spain, the peace of Carlowitz had been concluded with the Turks[2], this potentate, who had been embarrassed by the hostilities of that people, was then at liberty to exert the remaining force of the family of Austria for the maintenance of its pretensions. The British government, which had been recently combined with France in the treaties of partition, was at this time united with Austria, to resist and repress the ambition of its former ally. A second grand alliance[3] was accordingly formed against France in the first year of the eighteenth century, and William died in the following year, as if the formation of this confederacy were the completion of the purpose, for which he had been sent into existence.

Spain had sunk into a debility[4], which paralysed all the functions of its government, and appeared to render some considerable change indispensable even to the continuance of its political existence. Exhausted of its military strength by the efforts of the two earlier princes of the Austrian family, to maintain an ascendency over the other states of Europe, deprived of the industrious part of its population by the persecution and final expulsion of its Moorish inhabitants, and oppressed in its intellect and spirit by the benumbing influence of the tribunal of the Inquisition, it had rapidly declined under the later sovereigns of the Austrian dynasty, and the government seemed ready to expire through its own weakness, when the feeble reign of Charles II. was terminated by his untimely, though expected death. Of this incapable sovereign

[2] This peace had been mediated by the British and Dutch with the design of facilitating the military efforts of Austria.—Henault, vol. ii. p. 233. [3] This was composed of the emperor, Great Britain, the United Provinces, the empire, the kings of Portugal and Prussia, and the duke of Savoy, the several powers entering into it in this order. The allies engaged to procure for Austria the Spanish Netherlands, the duchy of Milan, the kingdom of the two Sicilies, and the ports of Tuscany, and never to permit the union of the two monarchies of France and Spain.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 194.

[4] Though murders were daily perpetrated in the capital, no inquiry was made about the guilty. The clergy and especially the monks, were not better than others.—Mem. Polit. et Milit. de Louis XIV. et XV., par Millot, tome ii. p. 92. Paris, 1777. Of the extreme imbecility of the government a striking picture is exhibited by lord Mahon, in his account of Spain under Charles II. Lond., 1840.

it has been well remarked[5], that he would have been unknown in history, if he had not made a will. Of the government it will be sufficient to mention two particulars, to characterise its deplorable condition under the last of the Austrian princes, the one exhibiting the utmost distress of financial embarrassment, the other the last excess of a cruel and corrupting bigotry. After the possessors of the gold and silver of America had recourse to sumptuary laws[6], and to a currency of copper rated far above its value, they at length found it necessary to expose to public sale the vice-royalties and governments, and even the dignity of grandees, for providing the means of relieving the wants of the state. In the blindness of the national bigotry on the other hand, when the joy of the people was to be manifested at the marriage of their sovereign[7], no better expression of the public satisfaction could be devised, than the celebration of an *auto da fe*, at which twenty-two victims of the Inquisition perished in the flames[8], and sixty others suffered corporal punishments.

But, though the government of Spain was thus rapidly approaching to a natural dissolution, its people maintained in their full vigour the principles, by which they had been accustomed to be actuated. They were not enlightened, for the inquisitorial spirit of their religious establishment had suppressed and stifled their intellectual energies; but in the hour of trial they clung with firmness to the prince[9], to whom the will of their last sovereign had bequeathed the crown of their country. When the regular resources of the government had been proved to be wholly insufficient

[5] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 441. [6] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d'Espagne, tome ii. pp. 499, 580, 581. [7] Ibid., p. 578. [8] The inquisitors of Barcelona represented to Mr. Townsend, that as long as the priesthood should be debarred from marriage, and confessors continue liable to abuse the confidence reposed in them, the secrecy, the prudence, and, when needful, the severity of the Inquisition, would be the only effectual restraint on the licentiousness and universal depravation of their morals.—Journey through Spain, vol. ii. p. 376. [9] How low this spirit descended in society appears from the following anecdote. 'The courtesans dispersed themselves among the troops of the archduke, and by their insidious familiarities destroyed more than had fallen in any single battle.' They boasted of their patriotism in having refused their favours to the king's troops.—Somerville's Reign of Queen Anne, p. 402, *note*. Lond., 1798.

for the maintenance of his cause, and the French king had been even compelled to abandon his grandson to his fate, the combined loyalty and independence of the Spanish people rallied round the sinking throne, and established it upon the discomfiture of their enemies. Perhaps no other nation has ever exhibited this combination of political decrepitude and of popular energy; and it may deserve attention to consider, to what causes it owed its existence in Spain.

The Spanish nation had been subjected to the action of various causes, which made a deep and lasting impression on the national character. Placed on the frontier of the Christian states of Europe, they had struggled almost eight centuries against the Arabs and Moors, and two centuries had not been sufficient for eradicating the romantic gallantry, which had been cherished in a struggle so peculiar, and so protracted. During one of those two succeeding centuries also they had maintained, in conjunction with Austria, a station so predominant among the European governments[10], that, when they afterwards sunk into decay and weakness, they could not wholly banish from their minds the proud persuasion of the superiority, which they had previously enjoyed, and other nations long continued to ascribe to them an importance, which had no sufficient foundation. But the grand cause perhaps of the preservation of an independent spirit among the Spaniards, amidst circumstances of national decay and degradation, was the cantoning of the people into so many distinct kingdoms or principalities, which by their reciprocal repulsion served to concentrate a spirit, that would otherwise have been wasted. Destitute of any general object, to which they might look with the affectionate regard of patriotic feeling, as they were neither animated by the conscious enjoyment of a free constitution, nor elevated by the pride of national prosperity, they yet found in the division of their country somewhat, which they could cherish, and for which they could contend. Although the Spaniard had then nothing, of which he could be proud, except the recollection of a departed greatness, the Castilian, or the Aragonian, might still dwell upon the pretension of his own particular kingdom to be esteemed superior to

[10] Watson's Hist. of Philip III., p. 525.

the other states of his sovereign, or at least to enjoy some favourable peculiarity in the qualities of the country, or of the people. There was no general diet, to which the several states might appeal for a vindication of their rights. Each of its principalities stood alone, and was even in some degree opposed to the rest; and their mutual jealousy preserved a spirit, which in the emergency of the public interests supplied the deficiency of a general patriotism.

The situation of Europe[11] was at this time favourable to the establishment of a prince of the house of Bourbon on the throne of Spain. The powers of the north were occupied by a war, which had recently burst forth against the Swedish government; the emperor was alarmed by the discontents of the Hungarians, who had lately associated themselves under the direction of a chief named Rakcczy[12]; and the erection of a ninth electorate in the favour of the house of Hanover had involved in a domestic contention the princes of Germany. It has accordingly been considered as probable that, if Louis had given to the maritime powers a sufficient security that the crown of Spain should not be annexed to that of France, he would have experienced little opposition in procuring the former for a prince of his family. But the French monarch, far from adopting any prudent expedient for disarming the jealousy naturally entertained of him, appears to have had recourse industriously to every measure, which might justify apprehension, and generate a hostile combination. Immediately before the duke of Anjou departed for Spain, the king issued letters-patent reserving to this prince his right of succeeding to the throne of his original country. By this preliminary declaration he challenged generally the jealousy of the other powers. By his subsequent proceedings he gave special cause of alienation to each of the two maritime governments. The Dutch were above all things apprehensive of seeing the Spanish Netherlands in the possession of the French, regarding them as a barrier indispensably necessary to the protection of their own country. Louis however, instead of dissipating their fears by a cautious system of conduct, procured from the council of Madrid an authority over these provinces co-or-

[11] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 262—264. [12] In the year 1692.

dinate to that of the Spanish crown, and sent into them French troops, avowedly destined to act against the Dutch, as the enemies of Philip and of France. In the English parliament a considerable party was adverse to the foreign policy of William, persuaded that the interest of England might be best promoted by disengaging it from the struggles of the continent. Louis again, at the death of James II.[13], found an opportunity of determining that parliament to a vigorous prosecution of hostilities against himself[14], by recognising the son of James as king of England, in open disregard of a stipulation of the treaty of Ryswick.

The emperor, indignant at the disappointment of his family, was the first mover of the war of the succession. He could not however venture to engage in hostilities[15], until the impolitic conduct of Louis had alienated the Dutch and the English, and decided those nations to conclude with him the treaty, which has been distinguished as the second grand alliance. Nor was the emperor able to maintain the first place in this confederacy, though he was the instigator of the war, and his indemnification was the professed object of the league. Besides that the empire was agitated by the establishment of the ninth electorate, the emperor was soon occupied by the Hungarian insurrection, with which he had been already menaced. This insurrection continued almost during the whole time of the war, having been begun two years after its commencement, and being suppressed only in the year preceding the adjustment of the preliminaries of peace between England and France. The attention and the forces of that monarch were accordingly diverted from the effective prosecution of any scheme of external policy; and thus, as in the preceding war, the field was left open to the British government, for assuming without competition the station of the secondary power in the general system. In the reduced state of the imperial power an insurrection of Hungary was competent to effect such a diversion, as had before resulted from a preceding insurrection supported by the utmost efforts of the Turkish empire[16].

[13] In the year 1701. [14] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 264. [15] Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 444—447. [16] The Hungarian insurrection of count Tekeli, which was begun in the year 1679, proved the occasion of the hostility of Turkey, which was declared four years

The political process, of which William had been the grand agent, was at this time perfected. A temporary connexion of the two governments of the Dutch and British had been established, by which the latter became at once involved in the continental policy of the former. A war had then been waged, in which France and Great Britain assumed their respective positions, as the leading powers in the new system of policy; and, when the arrangement of the interests of Europe was to be rendered more perfect by a new disposition of the dominions of the Spanish government, a great confederacy had been again combined, by which this part of the adjustment was at length effected. At such a juncture it was not inconvenient, that the direct connexion of the British government with the Dutch republic should be dissolved by the death of William. Heinsius, the pensionary of Holland, survived to maintain among his countrymen the system of that prince[17], who had been his protector, and to form with prince Eugene, who commanded the imperialists, and with the duke of Marlborough, who commanded the British troops, and directed the operations of the whole alliance, an illustrious triumvirate, adequate to manage with effect a confederacy so cumbrous that, as the duke remarked[18], he had eight different nations in his army.

The domestic situation of Great Britain under the government of Anne shall be considered in another chapter. But it naturally occurs in this place to reflect how peculiar was that combination of events, while the domestic interests of Great Britain were abandoned to the play of parties by the weakness of a female sovereign of very ordinary talents, provided for the management of its foreign interests a ge-

afterwards. From this time to the peace of Carlowitz, concluded two years after that of Ryswick, was the power of the emperor employed without intermission in resisting the combined exertions of his own revolted subjects in Hungary and of the Ottoman government; and while Louis XIV. was alarming Germany with his unauthorised pretensions, its sovereign was invested in his capital by the Turks, and indebted to the Poles for his deliverance. [17] He was especially serviceable in maintaining, by his influence among his own countrymen, the financial concerns of the alliance.—Louis XIV., &c., par Anquetil, tome iii. p. 283. [18] Mem. of the M. de Torcy, vol. i. p. 307. Lond., 1757.

neral, so eminently endowed as the duke of Marlborough with the very different qualities of a commander and a negotiator[19]. The government was thus permitted to be feeble at home, while it was respected abroad; and that agitation of domestic parties, which was conducive to its interior arrangement, was reconciled with a powerful exertion of the national force, which upheld the external relations of the state.

Nor was the play of domestic parties, for which the feeble government of Anne afforded so ample opportunity, destitute of an important influence on the conduct of the war. When Marlborough, like the avenging minister of heaven[20], was overwhelming the enemies of his country with discomfiture and dismay, when the ambitious sovereign of France, to whom flattery in the beginning of his reign had given a motto[21] expressing a proud defiance of an allied world, was reduced to stipulate only[22], that he should not be required to turn his arms against that grandson, whom himself had placed upon the throne of Spain, when that monarch, in the anguish of disappointed ambition, had burst into tears publicly in his council[23], thus acknowledging his utter inability to extricate his country from its difficulties, then it was that[24]

[19] Somerville says that he promoted the interests of the confederacy by the success of his negotiations, more than by the effects of his generalship, during the campaign of the year 1707. While Charles XII. of Sweden was deliberating, whether he should indulge his resentment against the emperor, by acceding to an alliance proposed by France, or attack the czar for having compelled Stanislaus to abdicate the crown of Poland, the duke determined him to prosecute the war of Russia.—Reign of Queen Anne, p. 242. [20] Johnson has objected to this, the single poetical image in Addison's *Campaign*, that the comparison is too nearly identical, but surely an avenging angel is sufficiently exalted above mortality, to ennoble by comparison.

[21] *Nec pluribus impar.* [22] Mem. Polit. et Milit. de Louis XIV. et XV., tome iv. p. 117. [23] St. Simon, tome i. p. 91. [24] Professor Heeren has well remarked, that there will be found no closer resemblance to the struggle of the two parties in Carthage, than that of the whigs and tories during the war of the Spanish succession in England; and demands whether the latter were not justified in wishing for peace, although Marlborough, at the head of the whigs, was against it. But he has not noticed, that Great Britain was saved from the permanence of the power of a war-party by that peculiar constitution of government, which placed its overthrow within the operation of a private intrigue, whereas the war-party in the popular government of Carthage, secure against such a reverse, was able to push the state to

a fluctuation of the English parties annihilated at once the power of the English general, and put a period to the war on conditions accommodated, though not to the actual circumstances of the belligerent powers, yet to the equilibrium of Europe. For forming a just conception of the important influence of this change of the ministry of England, it is only necessary to read the language, in which the French writers of that period endeavoured to express their feeling of the national deliverance. The all-powerful hand, says the duke St. Simon[25], which with the sands of the shore sets bounds to the most furious tempests of the ocean, suddenly arrested the ruin of this once formidable king. Such a revolution, says the marquess de Torcy[26], was to be the handiwork of God; the industry or vain policy of man could never flatter itself to be able to effect it; and whoever should previously have declared, that such things should happen, would have been treated as a visionary.

However extraordinary and unexpected was this change of the policy of Great Britain, it was yet in strict correspondence to a foreign event, which at that time reversed the interests of the confederated powers. The grand alliance, originally formed to procure for the archduke Charles such a portion of the Spanish territories, as might balance the aggrandisement of France in the acquisition of the throne of Spain, was afterwards, in consequence of an accession of strength, extended to the project of rendering the archduke sovereign of that country, instead of a prince of the family of Bourbon. The emperor however, dying without leaving male children, left the throne of the empire open to that archduke, for whose elevation to the throne of Spain the allies were then contending. Instead therefore of an eventual union of the crowns of France and Spain, which might be the result of some future contingency, Europe was menaced with an immediate conjunction of those of Spain and the empire, a combination in the time of Charles V. the most formidable to its independence. The new ministry of England therefore, already desirous of de-

its destruction in the struggle with Rome.—Hist. Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Carthaginians Ethiopians and Egyptians, p. 275, note. Oxford, 1832. [25] St. Simon, tome i. p. 93. [26] Memoirs of the M. de Torcy, vol. ii. p. 99.

stroying by a peace the domestic influence of Marlborough, were on general grounds of foreign policy justified in relinquishing that, which had latterly been the great object of the war.

It was the opinion of Mably[27] that if Philip V. had been without opposition placed on the throne of Spain, the two nations, less sensible of the necessity of union, would have acted thenceforward in correspondence to their former interests. The distance of Spain from the other territories of the house of Austria had precluded the hostility, which exists among neighbouring nations, and the Spanish sovereignty of the Netherlands even served to connect the two countries, affording a communication to the one, and depending on the other for protection. The relative circumstances of France and Spain were wholly different. Confining each on the other, both at the Pyrenees and in the Netherlands, they were naturally prepared for jealousy and contention, nor could France have indulged that spirit of aggrandisement, which is natural to a military government, without beginning with the possessions of Spain. The war of the succession was then the rough process, by which these countries, notwithstanding the adverse influence of a close and twofold vicinage, were brought to a harmony of feeling, by uniting them during so many years in the severe struggle of a common cause, the Spaniards being at the same time[28] alienated from the imperialists by the antipathy, with which they regarded their heretical allies of the United Provinces and of Great Britain.

Another connexion was also effected by the war, which has considerably contributed to the prosperity of Great Britain, and to the equilibrium of the general system. While Spain became connected with France, Portugal on the other hand attached itself to Great Britain[29]. The Portuguese government had at first connected itself with the party of France; but whether it was alarmed by the fleets of the maritime powers, or bribed by the offer of some dismemberments of the Spanish territories in the peninsula and in America, it speedily went over to the grand alliance, and

[27] Mably, tome vi. pp. 218—220. [28] Mem. Polit. et Milit. de Louis XIV. et XV., tome iii. p. 251. [29] Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 452, 453.

became active in distressing the government of Spain. So important was this accession deemed, that it extended the views of the allies from plans of mere partition and dismemberment to the ambitious project of a total conquest. The result did not indeed correspond to the sanguine expectation of the confederated powers; but in the struggle a close and intimate connexion was formed between Portugal and Great Britain, which increased the commercial resources of our government[30], and assisted in balancing the augmentation of French power, accruing from the establishment of a French prince on the throne of Spain. Nor did the influence of this connexion cease with the existence of the federative system, of which it constituted a combination, for it has since been mainly instrumental in overthrowing the enormous dominion, which had crushed that system, and in affording to Europe an opportunity for restoring among its governments the combinations of a balanced policy.

Voltaire[31] has pointedly described the progress of the negotiations of the peace of Utrecht, by remarking that France received the law from England, and dictated it to the empire. In the war of thirty years, and in the negotiations of Westphalia, by which that war was concluded, France assumed and sustained the character of guardian of the liberties of Germany, and protector of its princes. The reign of Louis XIV. had at length reversed this policy[32]. The ambition

[30] In the year 1703 was concluded the Methuen treaty, by which Portugal engaged to admit the woollen manufactures of England, on the condition that England should admit the wines of Portugal under duties less by one-third than those of France.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 221, *note*. This treaty was at length relinquished in the year 1831. [31] Siecle de Louis XIV. pp. 455, 456.

[32] The relation thus established between France and the states of Germany, gave being to a connexion of sufficient power, to enable the states to encroach on their sovereign in their turn. Ten years only had elapsed from the conclusion of the treaty of Westphalia, when this became manifest in the formation of the league of the Rhine, which procured for France so much influence in the affairs of the empire, as often surpassed that of the emperor. It was continued to the year 1666.—Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 362, 364. Twenty-two years after the peace of Westphalia, Bavaria, which in the preceding war had been the great support of the imperial power against the protestant confederacy, concluded with France a secret alliance, which was strengthened by the marriage of the daughter of the elector with the dauphin.—Ibid., p. 382. The operation of this alliance was conspicuous in the war

and violence of that monarch[33] had excited among the German princes a universal alarm; and the same spirit of independence, which had before thrown the empire into the arms of France, devoted it at this time to the house of Austria for its security. So complete was the revolution of the policy of Germany, that Sweden, which had been formidably opposed to the Ferdinands, maintained at this time but a precarious influence in the empire, and that only by connecting itself intimately with the family of Austria. But, though the states of the empire and the reigning family were thus united in hostility against France, the power of Great Britain, guided by the genius of Marlborough, and supported by the influence of the pensionary of Holland, was the moving principle of the confederacy. When therefore the British government was by its internal change of parties disposed to conclude a peace with France, its change of policy permitted the French government to insist upon conditions much less favourable to the interests of the Dutch and Germans, than those which it had before been ready to concede. Some successes[34], obtained by the French during these negotiations, compelled the Dutch to yield a reluctant assent, unwilling as they were to relinquish the pride of being arbiters of the peace of Europe. The emperor, more directly interested in the Spanish succession, which had become the grand object of the war, was more obstinate in his opposition, nor could he be at all persuaded to recognise his rival on the throne[35], for which he had contended. When some further successes of the French had at length convinced him of the necessity of acquiescing in a pacification[36], he chose rather to conclude with France a separate treaty, which should contain no mention of the crown of Spain.

In the treaty of Utrecht, concluded in the year 1713, it was stipulated for the general interest of Europe, that France and Spain should never be united under the government of

of the Spanish succession, in which the elector of Bavaria was the zealous ally of France; and forty years afterwards, when the extinction of the male line of the German branch of the house of Austria had in the like manner exposed its possessions to the pretensions of various claimants, the favour was returned by France in the efforts exerted for advancing the elector to the throne of the empire. [33] Ibid., pp. 446, 449.

[34] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 304. [35] Ibid., pp. 304, 323. [36] Ibid., pp. 324, 331.

the same prince[37], and that the grandson of Louis should accordingly make his final option between the inheritance of his family and his new sovereignty; and it was also provided that a sufficient barrier should be established for protecting the Dutch provinces against the ambition of France[38]. For the particular interest of the British empire various commercial advantages were obtained. The command of the Mediterranean was secured by the cession of Gibraltar and Minorca[39], which had been conquered in the war; that of the northern seas of America was restored by the restitution of Newfoundland and of Hudson's Bay, and strengthened by the cession of Nova Scotia; and a new commerce was opened with the American dependencies of Spain, by the *assiento* contract for supplying them during thirty years with negroes, an advantage granted by Philip at his accession to the French.

The treaty of Utrecht has been the subject of much reproach, as disproportioned to the distinguished successes of the allied powers, and insufficient for securing the independence of Europe. That it was disproportioned to the successes of the allies must be acknowledged. They had reduced the French monarch from the high pretensions of a grasping ambition to the humiliating stipulation, that he should not be required to turn his arms against that grandson, whom himself had placed upon the throne of Spain, while he even offered to furnish subsidies for the assistance of the allies[40]; and yet the treaty confirmed this very prince in the possession of the throne. But it has been justly remarked[41], that the views of the allies had expanded with their successes, and in the progress of the struggle a more enlarged concep-

[37] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 307—309. [38] This was regulated by the treaties of Rastadt and Baden concluded in the year 1714, and by the barrier-treaty in the year 1715. The Spanish Netherlands were ceded to the emperor, to be garrisoned conjointly by the emperor and the Dutch republic, the emperor furnishing three-fifths, and engaging to pay annually from their revenues five hundred thousand crowns for the maintenance of the Dutch troops. Great Britain also was bound to guarantee the barrier, and to maintain it by arms.—Ibid., pp. 340—343. [39] This island was taken by the French in the year 1756, restored to Great Britain in the year 1763, taken by the Spaniards in the year 1782, and ceded to that people in the year 1783. [40] Mem. of M. de Torcy, vol. ii. pp. 73, 74.

[41] Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 504.

tion of the satisfaction necessary for the house of Austria began to be entertained. It accordingly happened that a treaty, inadequate to the later expectations of the confederated powers, was yet sufficient for accomplishing the original purpose of their union. The dismemberment of the territory of the Spanish crown deprived the new sovereign of much of the distant appendages of his royalty[42]; the war too had provided a counterpoise by throwing Portugal into a close connexion with the British government; and the establishment of a barrier for the Dutch had done for them all which could be proposed, when the advancement of the archduke to the imperial throne had rendered the transfer of the Spanish crown to this prince irreconcilable to the true spirit of the confederacy.

The value of the acquisition of the Spanish Netherlands was considerably diminished to Austria by the commercial restrictions[43], with which it was shackled in favour of the two maritime powers. These provinces however, it is admitted[44], constituted the link, connecting the interest of Austria with the maritime resistance, which was at this time opposed to the encroachments of French ambition. The restriction of the trade of the Netherlands, as it gave to the maritime states a direct interest in preserving these provinces in a situation so favourable to themselves, was the price of that protection. Seventy years afterwards this treaty was abrogated by the impetuous Joseph II., who placed an undoubting confidence in his connexion with France[45], and was impatient to revive the commerce of this part of his dominions by opening the navigation of the Scheldt; but the revolutionary war with France, and the loss of the Netherlands,

[42] The kingdom of the two Sicilies was ceded to the duke of Savoy, Gibraltar and Minorca to Great Britain, and the Spanish Netherlands to the emperor.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 319, &c. The kingdom of the two Sicilies was however recovered by Spain in the year 1735, when Charles IV. son of Philip V. of Spain was placed upon that throne.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 313.

[43] These restrictions, and especially the closing of the Scheldt, had been imposed by the treaty of Munster, concluded between the Spaniards and the Dutch just before the peace of Westphalia, and were confirmed by the barrier treaty.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 117, 342, 343.

[44] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 586.

[45] Ibid., pp. 586, 588.

both which occurred within seven years from this disturbance of the existing system, furnish no favourable commentary on his policy.

The changes, about this time effected in the internal relations of Germany, corresponded in a very remarkable manner to its altered circumstances in relation to the system of Europe. The federative combinations of the empire having discharged their function, in giving a beginning to the formation of a corresponding policy among the independent governments of Europe, it was no longer necessary that this form of constitution should preserve its energy, and it would probably have even caused some disturbance to the system, by affording to other states a facility of interfering in the concerns of Germany. A new arrangement of interior policy was accordingly constituted for that country in the beginning of the eighteenth century, by the formation of the kingdom of Prussia in the year 1701, and by the augmentation of the power of Austria received nine years afterwards from the final reduction of Hungary. A new and different equilibrium was thus created in Germany, the whole government resolving itself into two distinct combinations, of which that of the Roman Catholics sought protection under the power of Austria, while that of the Protestants regarded Prussia as its head. This was not fitted to extend through Europe the relations of a federative policy, but it was sufficiently suited to a state of the general system, in which these had been already formed. Prussia has been actively concerned in the diplomacy of Europe, but as an independent sovereignty, not as a member of a German confederacy.

Two distinct wars, by which Europe in the commencement of the eighteenth century was menaced in the north and in the south, presented a favourable conjuncture for gratifying the elector of Brandenburg with the title of royalty.[46] So

[46] The emperor, who in the year 1695, had refused to acknowledge Prussia as a secular duchy, did not hesitate to acknowledge it as a kingdom, when the elector of Brandenburg promised his aid against France. Great Britain and the Dutch were conciliated by the same consideration. In the north the differences, which had recently broken out between the king of Sweden on the one part, and the sovereigns of Poland, Denmark and Russia on the other, procured the consent of all these states, being alike desirous of gratifying the elector.—Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 444.

many powers were interested in conciliating him, that there were few dissentients, and Frederic I., crowning himself with his own hands, began the series of the kings of Prussia. The new kingdom was in its intrinsic resources much inferior to Austria. Composed by successive acquisitions of scattered and dissimilar provinces, and destitute of those natural demarcations, which designate a territory as one, and give to its people the habits of political combination, it had no solid basis in the physical or moral condition of its subjects. It was in truth a great army variously recruited; its king was a general, and its real capital a camp. It was accordingly, in the internal system of Germany, the secondary or rival state, opposed to the compact and solid strength of the Austrian dominions.

The reign of Louis XIV. is interesting, not merely as it gave occasion to the later and more perfect arrangement of federative policy, but also as it has taken a place among the few periods distinguished for the intellectual improvement of our species. It has indeed been acknowledged by the French historian of that age [47], that his country cannot claim for it a pre-eminence of scientific inquiry, which he admits to have belonged to England, the pretension of the French being limited to those lighter studies which pertain to general literature. The literature of France however became the literature of Europe, as its language by the predominant influence of its government became generally prevalent; and was adopted at once as a dialect of the more refined in each country, and as the common speech of different states.

The French language before the reign of Louis XIV. was unformed. Malherbe, who died in the year 1628, had just shown that in poetical composition it was capable of strength and elevation [48]; and Balzac, who survived him twenty-six

[47] Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii. pp. 161, 167. 168.

[48] Ronsard had before composed heroic odes, but, in proposing Pindar for his model, he had more frequently become bombastic and obscure, han strong and elevated.—Les Trois Siecles de la Litt. Françoise par Sabatier de Castres, tome iii. p. 158. Mangenot, who died in the year 1768, has given the following whimsical history of the French poetry. 'La poësie Françoise, sous Ronsard et sous Baif, étoit un enfant au berceau, dont on ignoroit jusq'au sexe. Malherbe le soupçonna mâle, et lui fit prendre la robe virile. Corneille en fit une héros. Racine en fit une femme adorable et sensible. Quinault en fit une courtisanne, pour la

years, had done a similar service to its prose[49], though it is confessed that all the faults of affectation characterise the style of this writer. . What had been thus recently begun in both species of composition, was brought to maturity by the genius, which the patronage of Louis fostered and encouraged. Corneille, who died in the year 1634, has been pronounced the first[50], who elevated the literary genius of France in creating its theatre ; but Racine, who died in the year 1699, exalted the dramatic poetry of his country to its highest perfection of elegance and dignified expression. Fenelon, who died in the year 1715, gave the utmost refinement to French prose, but in adopting the extraordinary expedient of composing a prosaic epic[51], bore at the same time, by the very excellence of his own work, the strongest testimony to the essentially unpoetical character of the language of his[52] country.

rendre digne d'épouser Lully, et la peignit si bien sous la masque que le sévère Boileau s'y trompa, et condamna Quinault à l'enfer, et sa muse aux prisons de St. Martin. Al'égard de Voltaire, il en à fait un excellent écolier de rhétorique, qui lutte contre tous ceux, qu'il croit empereurs de sa classe, et qu' aucun de ses pareilles n'ose entreprendre de dégoter, se contentant de s'en rapporter au jugement de la postérité, unique et seul préfet des études de tous les siecles.'—Les Trois Siecles de la Litt. Françoise par Sabatier de Castres, tome iii. p. 167. Paris, 1801. [49] Ibid., tome i. pp. 158, 159. Voltaire has remarked, that the same men of genius, as De Thou and L'Hopital, who had written admirably in the Latin language, failed in the management of their own, which was refractory in their hands; and that the language of France, as used by those older writers, was characterised by no other merit, than a certain simplicity, which was closely connected with irregularity and rudeness.—Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii. p. 168.

[50] Ibid., p. 367. [51] For this epic Fenelon was disgraced in France, because the character of Idomeneus was considered as a satire on the extravagance, the pomp, and the ambition of the king; but he was so much respected throughout Europe, that the duke of Marlborough, when the diocese of this bishop became the seat of war, took care to protect his lands.—Ibid., p. 315. [52] Credit should here be given to France, according to Sir W. Scott, for having at this time produced in Moliere the prince of the modern comedy, in partial derogation from the dramatic supremacy of our Shakespeare.—Rev. of Moliere in Misc. Prose Works, vol. xvii. But the pretension is resisted in an Art. in the Quart. Rev. for July, 1823, in which it is contended that the French writer, however eminent in wit, was inferior in not giving to the persons of his dramas the reality of individual character, but exhibiting rather the abstractions of classes, than the realities of living men. Ben Jonson this critic commends as the immediate parent of

To France in this period was Europe indebted for the commencement of those journals, which have since diffused generally through society some knowledge of the discussions of literature. Sallo, who died in the year 1669, was the inventor of this species of publication[53], and Gallois, who died in the year 1707, assisted in publishing, and afterwards continued, the *Journal des Savans*, the original of all those periodical productions. Invented for the purpose of establishing a communication among the learned, they have since been directed to another and much larger object, as they now furnish the unlearned with opinions on subjects, which they have not opportunity, or ability, to examine for themselves. The learning thus supplied may not be very profound, though dissertations of superior excellence are sometimes in this manner given to the public; but, by the wide diffusion of the knowledge contained in those journals, the intellect of the public is much more generally exercised, than it could be by any other expedient, and the mass of general information is very considerably increased.

The military system of France and of Europe[54] was in all its details the work of this prince. Military uniforms were introduced by him; the use of the bayonet, which had been very partial, was by him rendered general; and to him is due the management of the artillery with the improvement of the art of fortification, appropriate schools being founded for both departments. From the year 1672 he had a hundred and eighty thousand men of regular troops; and at length, as his forces were augmented in proportion to the number and power of his enemies, he had in arms, his marine forces being included, four hundred and fifty thousand

the English comedy, which he prefers to the French. Mr. Hallam has remarked, 'of Shakespeare we may justly say that he had the greater genius, but perhaps of Moliere, that he has written the best comedies.'—Introd. to the Literature of Europe, vol. iv. p. 474.

[53] Trois Siecles, tome ii. p. 315; tome iv. p. 196. Some have supposed, that the design had been suggested to Sallo, by the *Bibliographie Parisienne* of Jacob, who died at Paris in the year 1670. The object of this work had been to give an account of all books printed at Paris.—Ibid., p. 436. The first number was published in the year 1665. [54] Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii pp. 125—132. The very appellation *martinet*, used to designate a military officer more than usually attentive to discipline, was the name of one employed in the service of Louis.

men. He created a considerable navy, and councils were formed for improving the construction of ships. In these efforts however he came into a direct collision with the two maritime powers, and the naval force, which he had formed, received a defeat from their united fleets at the battle of La Hogue, fought in the year 1692, from which it was not recovered until the year 1751, when advantage was taken of the opportunity afforded by a long peace.

The civil government of France was in the mean time consolidated into a simple, though not a despotic monarchy, the only perfection consistent with its principles. The great lords[55], instead of cantoning the kingdom into a number of principalities, were drawn into attendance on the court of the sovereign; and the governors of provinces were no longer permitted to bestow important offices on their own dependents, and thus to become formidable to the very power, by which they had been constituted. The spirit of faction, which had agitated the country from the time of Francis II., was then at length suppressed; nor did the Huguenots engage in an insurrection, until their enemies had demolished their churches. The nation, which during more than a century had been dangerous to itself, was thus rendered formidable only to other states. It was prepared for maintaining, with all the necessary energy, its influence over the system, of which it was the principal and central member. The manners too of the people were at the same time refined in the societies, which females of rank assembled at their houses in the metropolis; and the authority of the king, provoked by an extraordinary combat[56], was successfully exerted in repressing the sanguinary spirit of duelling, which had been indulged to an excess, destructive at once of the tranquillity and of the morals of the public.

[55] Siecle de Louis XIV., tome ii. pp. 138—140. [56] A combat of four against four determined Louis to pardon this offence no more. Such was the influence of the example of France, that in the time of Voltaire the number of duels throughout Europe was a hundred times less, than in the time of Louis XIII.—Ibid., p. 125.

CHAPTER II.

Of the history of Great Britain, from the revolution in the year 1688 *to the commencement of the reign of Anne in the year* 1702.

Act of toleration, bill of rights, and first grand alliance, in the year 1689 —Presbyterianism established in Scotland, 1690 — Triennial bill, bank of England, 1694—The peace of Ryswick, 1697—Hanoverian succession established, second grand alliance, 1701—Anne queen, 1702.

THE transactions of the two reigns of William III. and Anne are intimately connected in two important respects, one belonging to the external, the other to the internal policy of the country. In the former of these relations they together constituted one eventful period of time, in which Great Britain assumed its station in the federative system of Europe, as the adversary of the overbearing power and ambition of France; and in the latter they likewise composed the period of the domestic transition of the government from the succession of hereditary sovereigns to the establishment of the Hanoverian family on a title strictly parliamentary. Each reign had however also its peculiar object of domestic arrangement, which requires to be separately examined. To accomplish the revolution was the work of William; to effect the union of the two kingdoms of Great Britain was reserved for the reign of Anne. The two measures were proposed together by William to the Scotish convention; but it was soon discovered, that the former should be separated from the difficulties unavoidably embarrassing the latter.

The illustrious vindication of national rights, which was effected by the elevation of William, was in its immediate operation limited to England. In Scotland the change of the sovereign was but an occasional alternation of the parties of an unsettled government, and the true epoch of its political improvement, was the union, by which it was incorporated with the improved government of the neighbouring country. The state of the parties of Ireland was such as did not admit a voluntary adoption of the change

effected in England, and the fate of the revolution was there decided by the sword. Ireland however had also her own revolution, though long after that of England. The principles of freedom, cherished in the more considerable member of the compound government, could not be hindered from diffusing themselves into the neighbouring country, though subjected to the oppressions of a conquered province; and the acknowledgment of the independence of Ireland constituted, almost a century later than that of England, the real revolution of the Irish government.

Concerning the nature and character of the British revolution two extreme and opposite opinions have been maintained. Doctor Price, in his anxiety to procure a sanction for principles of the most enlarged independence, has insisted that[1], among the rights established by it, was 'that of cashiering our governors for misconduct, and of framing a government for ourselves,' adopting a form of expression modified by no consideration of urgent necessity, or of reverence for existing institutions. Mr. Burke on the other hand has with no less vehemence contended[2], that the revolution of England explicitly discountenanced such principles, that it was in truth but a renovation of the established system of the government, which James had laboured to destroy, and that it bore a direct correspondence to the preceding crisis of the restoration, in which, as in the flight of James, the monarchical part of the government was deficient, and the constitution was regenerated by the parts, which remained.

Bishop Hurd[3] has given a middle character of this interesting crisis, which appears to be much more agreeable to the truth than either of these representations. 'This,' says he, 'will be considered by grateful posterity as the true era of English liberty. It was interwoven indeed with the very principles of the constitution. It was inclosed in the ancient trunk of the feudal law, and was propagated from it. But its operation was weak and partial in that state of its infancy. It acquired fresh force and vigour with age, and has now at length extended its influence to every part of

[1] Plowden's Jura Anglorum, p. 161. Dubl., 1792. [2] Reflections on the Revol. in France, pp. 21, &c. Dubl., 1790.

[3] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Transactions, p. 711.

the political system.' This description does not characterise the revolution, with Doctor Price, as an actual dissolution of the government; nor does it, with Mr. Burke, exhibit that event as a mere recurrence to a former order, in which a mischief was remedied and some precautions were employed for preventing a renewal of it, but no progressive amendment of the government was in any respect effected. It represents this remarkable event as an expansion of principles inherent in the constitution, and at length developed amidst the favourable circumstances of a particular crisis.

Agreeably to this view of the predispositions to the formation of a free constitution, we find that not only the claims of the bill of rights were urged as the ancient and hereditary pretensions of English subjects, but the very principle of the revolution itself had been before introduced into the practice of the government. The distinguishing principle of the revolution was, that the crown was then transferred by a parliamentary settlement; and this very principle we find long before recognised as constitutional, even, as it seems, in relation to the exclusion of that very family of the Stuarts, which was by it ultimately deprived of the throne. Henry VIII., arbitrary and violent as he was, judged it expedient to procure from the parliament an authority for disposing of the crown, probably with a design of precluding the succession of the Scotish princes; and again, when Elizabeth was desirous of guarding herself against the intrigues of Mary, she caused it to be enacted, that it should be high treason to declare, that the queen and the parliament had not power to limit the succession. One member of the government was indeed deficient, when James had deserted the government, and thus is the case of the revolution distinguishable from those by which it had been preceded; it was however only an extended application of the principle already established, that the nation might determine the choice of its governors, and justified by the necessity, under which it was adopted.

Even the very consideration, which chiefly decided the revolution, had been already under discussion, and with partial success, in the efforts employed nine years before to defeat the succession of James by the bill of exclusion, which passed in the commons, but was rejected by the lords.

That it was not then adopted with entire success, was however salutary to the government, as its entire success could not have been equally beneficial with the revolution, which the bill of exclusion would have anticipated. The mere apprehension of the future bigotry of James was not sufficient to overcome the strong repulsion, by which the Whigs and Tories were mutually alienated; and it was necessary that his actual endeavours to destroy the religious establishment of the kingdom should open the eyes of its supporters, and convince them that they could be secure only in connecting themselves with their ancient adversaries. If James had been cut off from the succession by the bill of exclusion, he would have been precluded from an opportunity of assailing the church of England, and no sufficient cause would have operated to compress into union the contending parties of the state. The discussion of the principle must have served however, to prepare the minds of the Tories for their subsequent rejection of James, and to dispose them to form a junction with the Whigs, their antagonists.

The circumstances of the family of James were at the same time very remarkably accommodated to the crisis. It was at the time of the revolution, composed of two daughters, Mary and Anne, both Protestants, and before his accession to the throne married to protestant princes, and of a son, born but a few months before his final rupture with his subjects, and from his birth devoted to the religion of Rome. By the protestant daughters the transfer of the allegiance of the people to a new series of sovereigns was rendered less violent, while by the Roman Catholic pretender to the succession an external apprehension was supplied for promoting internal unanimity. The successive advancement of the daughters of James to the throne gratified the affection, with which the Tories regarded his family; and, though Mary refused to accept the crown, except on the condition of tranferring the royal authority entire to her husband, yet the unavoidable absences of that prince afforded frequent opportunities for exhibiting the daughter of the former monarch as the actual sovereign. Nor was the son of James less serviceable by alarming the fears of the nation. Educated in the religion of Rome, and under the protection of the

natural enemy of England, he was to the great majority of the people an object of apprehension, not of attachment. We accordingly find that, as the protection afforded to James himself by Louis XIV. had strengthened the party of William at the time of the revolution, so his recognition of the son as king of England, upon the decease of his father, determined the nation to engage with vigour in a continental war, to which it had been disinclined.

Mary, the queen of William, died in the year 1694, eight years before the death of her husband. This was regarded by the friends of James as fatal to the stability of the new government, and the exiled king was strongly urged to avail himself of an opportunity so favourable by invading England[4]. Its real consequences however were that the interest of Anne became closely connected with that of William[5] and the revolution; that a coalition was formed with a party, which had been adverse to the court, and balanced between Anne and the banished king; and that the recognition of the right of Anne became the first of a series of measures, which opened the succession to the family of Hanover, and completed the protestant settlement of the monarchy.

It is a curious fact, that the prince of Hanover,[6] afterwards George I. of these countries, came to England to pay his addresses to Anne, but was speedily recalled by his father, that he might conclude a marriage with a daughter of the duke of Zell, then esteemed a more advantageous alliance. If this project had been effected, the parliamentary settlement of the crown would have been less distinctly apparent. The abandonment of it was therefore favourable to the improvement of the constitution, as it left the title of the Hanoverian family to the choice of the nation, declared by a parliamentary enactment, instead of blending the title con-

[4] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 495, 497. [5] Ibid., p. 496. The following note has been written by the Earl of Dartmouth on this event, as recorded by Burnet. "The earl of Nottingham, who was much in her confidence, told me, he was very sure, if she had outlived her husband, she would have done her utmost to have restored her father, but under such restrictions, as should have prevented his ever making any attempts upon the religion or liberties of his country." Such an arrangement however would have counteracted the influences of the revolution by checking its progress.—Burnet's Hist. of his own time, vol. xiv. p. 235. Oxf., 1823. [6] Tindal's Cont. of Rapin, p. 356. Dubl., 1748.

veyed by that settlement with another pretension, arising from his marriage with a daughter of the excluded sovereign.

In the variety of views, presented by this most interesting crisis of history, it occurs that we should consider the bearing of the double selection of foreign princes, concerned in the change of the dynasty of Great Britain; of the stadtholder of Holland, by whom it was begun, and of the elector of Hanover[7], by whom it was completed. Each of these personages was a foreigner and a prince, and each was connected with the family of the Stuarts, William by his mother, a daughter of Charles I., and George by his descent from a daughter of James I. We are to inquire, whether any peculiar adaptations may be discovered in the parts, which the two princes respectively acted in this important change of government, and whether the order, in which they interposed, corresponded to those parts.

For effecting a combination of political interests, which should engage the British government in the federative relations of the continent, it was necessary that the state, which should be instrumental in the process, should be sufficiently important to be the centre of the negotiations, in which Great Britain was to be involved. Nor would inconvenience be experienced from its power during the crisis of the struggle, because the whole resources of both would be required for the common cause. When however the combination had been effected, a less considerable state might maintain it more consistently with the peculiar interest of Great Britain, as less diverting the attention of the common sovereign from its government. It appears therefore to have been even on this account expedient, that a Dutch prince should but make way for the advancement of an elector of Hanover. The commercial character of the Dutch republic suggests another consideration. For converting the continental balance of the European governments into another arrangement, in which the power of a commercial state should maintain the equilibrium, it was necessary that the government instrumental to the change should be itself commercial. Two commercial governments however could not

[7] Hanover was by the emperor constituted a ninth electorate in the year 1692, but the measure did not receive the sanction of the empire before the year 1708.

continue connected, except during the urgent apprehension of a common danger, because their commercial interests must in other circumstances render them rivals. It was therefore also on this account expedient, that the death of William should quickly dissolve the connexion of the two governments, especially as the influence of his pupil Heinsius continued to preserve to our government, for a sufficient time the necessary influence over the counsels of the United Provinces. The British government, from being a party in the grand alliance against France, had sensibly become engaged in a lasting struggle of the two nations; and the United Provinces, disengaged from their temporary connexion with a commercial rival were left to manage without any inconvenient interference their own commercial interests.

That a prince of the empire should succeed may be inferred from the connexion with Austria, generated by a common opposition to France, as the enemy of both. That this prince might best be the elector of Hanover has been admitted even by Hume[8], though he thought it desirable, that our sovereigns should not possess any territory on the continent. 'It must however be acknowledged,' says he, 'that Hanover is perhaps the spot of ground in Europe the least inconvenient for a king of England. It lies,' he adds, 'in the heart of Germany, at a distance from the great powers, which are our natural rivals: it is protected by the laws of the empire as well as by the arms of its own sovereign: and it serves only to connect us more closely with the house of Austria, our natural ally.'

The double change of the succession was not less accommodated to the adjustment of the domestic interests of the British government. The presbyterian tenets of William admitted, without any repugnance, the establishment of a presbyterian church in Scotland, which removed the great obstruction out of the way of the subsequent incorporation of the two governments. The Lutheran form of religion on the other hand, professed by the Hanoverian family, being in some degree of an episcopal administration, was better suited to the institutions of the principal member of the united kingdom, when that important combination had been effected. The republican form of the government of the

[8] Essay on the Protestant Succession.

Dutch provinces also, however it might sufficiently correspond to the state of Great Britain in the crisis of a revolution, must have been less fitted for a permanent connexion with it, than the mixed government of a principality[9], in which, as in Great Britain, there is an assembly of states.

The interposition of a daughter of James between William and the first of the Hanoverian princes, seems to have afforded a favourable opportunity for effecting the great measure of a union with Scotland, that queen having stood in a doubtful situation between the two parties, which divided the country. It is known that[10], in her various attempts to conciliate the Scots, overtures were made to the Jacobites, implying not obscurely a disposition favourable to her brother.

An influence more immediately affecting the English government, was that the reign of Anne afforded an opportunity for such a free play of parties, as tended to reduce the repugnant sentiments of Whigs and Tories to a middle standard of constitutional freedom. This had been begun by the policy of William, who in his several ministries availed himself of the services of both parties[11], though he generally inclined the balance in favour of the Whigs, as his natural adherents. Though the reign of a daughter of James was hailed by the Tories, as peculiarly their own, the dangers[12], with which she was threatened by the discontents of Scotland, and the war-party headed by the duke of Marlborough, soon threw her, for the greater part of her reign, into the arms of their adversaries, from which she extricated herself but a short time before her death. The effect of this alternation of parties was that their principles became so modified by the changes of their circumstances, that in similar situations, whether in official station or in opposition, they exhibited a striking resemblance, the Tories learning to struggle against the abuses of prerogative, and the Whigs to give support to the just authority of the

[9] The states of the electorate have their part in the government; and this privilege has never been infringed by the king, or, that I have heard of, by any of his predecessors.—Burke's Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs, p. 93. Lond., 1791. [10] Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 163. [11] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 691, 695. [12] Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, pp. 47—48.

crown. The overtures, made by the Tories to the court of Hanover[13], when they had been thrown into opposition, furnish a decisive example. Fortunately for the interest of freedom, the Whigs, who had then the advantage of possessing power, were enabled to proffer more immediate services.

The two parties were thus brought into so near an approximation, that they were capable of acting without hostility in a balanced government. But the spirit of such a government seems, at least in that period, to have required, that such a distinctness should continue to be maintained between the two parties, as might assist in supporting by their mutual opposition the equilibrium of the constitution. This distinctness accordingly was long maintained by the test-law, which had been enacted with the consent of the Whigs themselves in the reign of Charles II., and which all the influence, acquired by that party at the revolution, proved afterwards unable to annul[14]. Both parties were much more steady in adhering to those principles of ecclesiastical polity[15], about which they had originally separated, than in respect of questions merely political. This law accordingly, though, at the time of its enactment, it was designed only to act against Romish dissenters, and with that view was then supported by the Presbyterians, became afterwards a barrier, by which the two parties of Protestants were preserved from being confounded.

The constitution at the same time provided qualifications of the rigour of the test-law, which preserved the protestant dissenters from degenerating into a faction, separated from, and inimical to the state. Protestant dissenters, though by this law excluded from public offices, were not excluded from the parliament, the party opposed to the crown not being then able to carry so far the disqualification of Roman Catholics[16], and being afterwards by the false rumour of the

[13] Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 126. [14] They were however able to hinder it from becoming an article in the Scotish union, by which it would have been rendered perpetual.—Bruce's Report on the Scotish Union, addressed to the duke of Portland in the year 1799, vol. i. p. 361. [15] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 698. [16] The test-law was enacted in the year 1673, and the law excluding Roman Catholics from the parliament, in the year 1678.

popish plot enabled to exclude them without also disqualifying Protestants. The dissenters of the latter were thus retained within the pale of the constitution; and the political importance, which in this manner they continued to possess, at length, in the year 1727[17], the first year of the reign of George II., gave occasion to a practice of passing a law for indemnifying those of them, who held office without fulfilling its conditions, which, from the commencement of that of George III., has been annually enacted, so that the test-law was retained only as a political resource for some extreme contingency. In the year 1828, the principles of the Whigs prevailing in the legislature, the test-law was repealed.

Even within the ecclesiastical establishment itself a division was effected, which, graduating yet more perfectly the scale of party, precluded an abrupt separation of political sentiment, that might have disturbed the harmony of the public order. The principles of the revolution, though they spread little among the inferior clergy, found protectors among the prelates. The members of the establishment thus became divided into two parties, distinguished by the appellations of high and low church; and the struggle of the Whigs and Tories was brought within the precincts of the church itself, instead of being maintained between the church and its adversaries.

The slowness[18], with which the[19] convention-parliament granted supplies to William, and the danger of diminishing the military force of Great Britain in the first establishment of his power, hindered him from exerting any speedy and effectual effort for the reduction of the adverse party in Ireland. More than a year accordingly had elapsed, since he had been acknowledged as sovereign of England and Scotland, before he placed himself at the head of the army in the neighbouring island. That this delay favoured, instead of defeating the revolution, must be ascribed to the conduct of James, and of the party, by which he was sup-

[17] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. p. 334, note. [18] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 387. [19] This, like the parliament assembled at the restoration, was so named, because not assembled by royal authority. Both were by legislative acts of bodies converted into parliaments.

ported in Ireland. During this time James was placed in a state of probation[20], under the attentive observation of his former subjects of England. By a judicious use of this remaining opportunity he might perhaps have revived their affection for his person, have recovered their confidence in his declarations, and have effected his restoration to his former power. His actual conduct was the reverse of that, which might have produced these effects. It exhibited undisguised and naked the bigotry and violence of his principles; it satisfied the wavering, that there could be no peace between him and the constitution; it fixed upon a secure and immoveable basis the revolution, by which he had been excluded from power.

In these latter days we have been so accustomed to connect with the term revolution the notion of the subversion of all the authorities of a government, that it does not at the first view appear, why a name of so mighty an import should have been employed to designate the change, by which the family of the Stuarts was removed from the throne of these countries. Not only did the exterior form of the government remain unaltered, but the stipulations of the people were urged as their ancient, well-known and undoubted liberties. But, though in some respects no alteration was made, a real revolution, much more essentially affecting the constitution than by a mere change of the reigning family, was nevertheless effected.

It was the opinion of Hume[21], that a parliamentary settlement of the crown, by which the lineal heir was excluded, was an event necessarily productive of the most beneficial results, as it decided in favour of the popular part of the constitution those important questions of liberty and prerogative, which had agitated the nation during the government of the Stuarts. Public liberty, he has remarked, was hereby combined with public harmony; trade, manufactures and agriculture, made a rapid progress; and the improvement of the sciences and arts completed the prosperity of the country. But a later historian has shown[22], that the revolution has done much more, than merely to fix a constitution, which

[20] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 397—398. [21] Essay on the Protestant Succession. [22] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 715, &c.

has been unsettled. He has represented, that it was the memorable epoch of the legal establishment of religious toleration, as the result of that union of protestant parties, by which it was effected; and that it infused into the constitution a meliorating energy, by which our political condition continued to be improved. Among the constitutional improvements, which form the bright train of the English revolution, he has particularly noticed the amendment of the laws of treason[23], the limitation of the duration of parliaments[24], the independence of the judicial power[25], and, what this writer could but look to with the earnest aspirations of freedom and humanity, the prohibition of the traffic in the persons of men[26]. The important service rendered by the protestant dissenters, enforced by the personal anxiety of William for liberty of conscience, was rewarded with an act of toleration[27], which freed them from the penalties of former laws. They were indeed disappointed of the comprehension[28], which that monarch endeavoured to procure for

[23] This amendment was begun by the statute of William in the year 1695, and completed by that of Anne in the seventh year of her reign.—Hallam, vol. iii. pp. 221, 222. [24] A law limiting the duration of a parliament to three years was enacted by the long parliament in the year 1641, but was repealed in the year 1664. The limitation was again enacted in the year 1694, but in the year 1716 was extended to seven years. The re-enactment was a natural result of the conduct of Charles II. in prolonging his second parliament, to the enormous duration of seventeen years.—Lord Mahon's Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 300. Lond. 1836. [25] William in the year 1692, refused his consent to a law for securing the independence of the judges, but in the year 1701 it was made a part of the act of settlement.—Hallam's Constit. Hist., vol. iii. pp. 248, 262. [26] It was enacted in the year 1807. [27] By this act the penal laws were abolished, so far as they related to dissenters, who should take the oaths to the government; and dissenting ministers were protected, who moreover should subscribe the articles of the established church, except the thirty-fourth, the thirty-sixth, and a part of the twentieth. The dissenters had not yet in any considerable number separated from the established church in articles of doctrine.

[28] Three distinct attempts were made in England, to unite the Presbyterians with the Protestants of the established church: first in the conference of Hampton-court, held soon after the accession of James I.; secondly, in that of the Savoy, held immediately after the restoration; and thirdly, after the revolution. The first of these occasions had however been provided by James, merely that he might manifest the dislike which he entertained for the Scotish church, and his determination not to comply with the petition, presented to him by the Puritans of Eng-

them; but they were taken within the protection of the law, and they had the satisfaction and the security of seeing their form of religion established in the neighbouring kingdom of Scotland, as the acknowledged and favoured religion of the state.

Among the changes of this interesting crisis, one of the most important was the commencement of the funding system[29], which grew out of the revolutionary wars of William and Anne. This has been commonly represented as the high price, which these countries have paid for their freedom. It seems rather to be entitled to be considered as a necessary compensation introduced into the government, in the beginning of a period, in which all its commercial energies were to be developed. The great extension of British

land in his progress from Scotland. In the conference held at the Savoy, the Presbyterians, proud of the assistance which they had afforded in restoring the king, expected to receive from the Episcopalians proposals of concessions, which the latter on the other hand were not disposed to make, as they could not so soon forget, that they had been previously overthrown by the former. Even after the revolution, though there was on both sides more disposition to reconciliation, both parties having severely suffered under the temporary ascendency of the religion of Rome, sufficient jealousy still existed to frustrate the plan of union. The Presbyterians especially would propose no conditions, and received in silence the overtures of the Episcopalians. The former were probably jealous of the doctrine of passive obedience, which had been maintained by the established clergy; the latter were probably apprehensive of affording a fair pretence for a schism, which the Jacobite clergy, then under suspension, were threatening to make. After this time a comprehension ceased to be practicable, or indeed desirable, because the Presbyterians departed so generally from the doctrines, which they had held in common with the established church, that in the year 1773, only fifty, out of two thousand ministers, expressed an anxiety, that the existing restriction of the act of toleration should be maintained. Doctor Cardwell has observed, "we may safely affirm that the downfall of episcopacy in the north was one of the principal causes that preserved to the church of England at this period, its ancient integrity in doctrine and discipline."—Hist. of Conferences relative to the Liturgy, p. 420. Oxford, 1840.

[29] The total amount of the national debt at the death of William was 16,394,702*l.* 1*s.* 7*d.*, of which sum 9,861,047*l.* 2*s.* 2*d.* consisted of temporary annuities, and of debts, which would have been extinguished by the operation of the funds, on which they were charged. The whole revenue however did not, in the year 1693, exceed 1,570,318*l.*—Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. pp. 407, 425, 426. To assist in relieving the exigences of the state the bank of England was established in the year 1694.

commerce introduced a principle of perturbation by creating a monied interest, which necessarily possessed a considerable influence. The funding system on the other hand so connected that monied interest with the government, that the machinery of the constitution continued to work as before. Wealth, the representative of human labour, is power in the hand of him, by whom it is possessed; and a great monied interest, without a funding system, would be a great accumulation of power not controlled by the government. The money-bill is not negatived, and the crown reduced to mendicancy, because the creditors of the public would suffer with the executive authority. The folly, or the treachery of a minister, is held up to the execration of the people; but the main operations of the government are not obstructed nor the independence of the sovereign endangered. In an American debate it was once said [30], that a funding system was a contrivance devised by politicians, to supply the place of the feudal tenures. Though it does not appear to have been actually planned with any such intention, yet the one system has supplied the place of the other and with greater efficacy and permanence.

The revolution effected by William would have been incomplete and transient, if means had not been found for securing the succession to the family of Hanover. This accordingly was an object of that prince in the very commencement of his government, while it was yet uncertain whether he might not himself have an heir of his throne. The parties of England however were not yet prepared to accede to this measure [31], and the consideration of it was

[30] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. v. p. 600. Lond., 1807. The political influence of a funding system was discovered by Eumenes, one of the successors of Alexander, for we have been informed by Plutarch, that this prince, perceiving that he was hated by his nobles, borrowed considerable sums of money from those who were most hostile to him, that they might on account of their money feel an interest in his safety. The emperor Charles V. is said by De Thou (liv. 61.) to have adopted in the year 1575 the expedient of Eumenes, borrowing large sums from the Genoese, that he might secure their attachment. It is said by Bolingbroke and Swift, that bishop Burnet, with a similar view, advised William to involve the English nation in debt; but Sir John Sinclair was of opinion, that the debts contracted at the revolution were expedients of necessity, not of policy.—Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 415. [31] The Tories would not depart, in a second instance

suspended by the birth of a son of the princess Anne. At length in the year 1701, when this prince had died, it was felt by the Whigs, that some measure for settling the succession had become indispensable; and those of the Tories, who were attached to the interest of Anne, must have seen that her immediate succession would be rendered more secure by an arrangement, which should grant the reversion to a protestant prince of foreign extraction, than if it should be left open to the pretensions of nearer claimants. The Tories, as a party, appear to have endeavoured to frustrate the measure by encumbering it with various restrictions and conditions[32]; but the bill passed notwithstanding this indirect opposition, and the parliamentary disposition of the crown, begun in the advancement of William, was perfected in establishing the succession of[33] George I.

Though the question of the revolution was carried in the[34] convention-parliament of Scotland, as in that of England, the subsequent establishment of the new government experienced difficulties and embarrassments in the former kingdom, to which it was not exposed in the latter. In England[35] the revolution was happily the work of a coalition of adverse parties, which had alike discovered, that their religion and liberty were unsafe under the government of James; in Scotland it was chiefly, if not solely, the work of the Presbyterians, who were more anxious to avail themselves of the favourable opportunity for establishing their own ascendency, than to extend and secure the liberties of the na-

from the rule of hereditary succession; the Whigs were willing to leave the succession unsettled, in the hope that their posterity might find an opportunity of abolishing monarchy.—Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 340. [32] Ibid., pp. 666—667. [33] The princess Sophia, the mother of George I., was very far removed from an hereditary title. Besides the pretended prince of Wales and his sisters, whose legitimacy no one disputed, there stood in her way the duchess of Savoy, daughter of Henrietta duchess of Orleans, and several of the palatine family. These last had abjured the reformed faith; but it seemed not improbable that some one of them might return to it.—Hallam, Constit. Hist., vol. iii. p. 244. [34] This assembly was, like those convened in England at the restoration and the revolution, converted by a legislative act into a parliament, and was then, on account of the difficulties of the government, continued during the whole reign.—Laing, vol. ii. p. 199. [35] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans. pp. 560—561.

tion. While therefore William was exposed to the hostility of the other parties of Scotland, he was also engaged in a struggle with the Presbyterians, the more embarrassing, as their pretensions were offensive to the Episcopalians of England. To these pretensions William was induced to yield, in relinquishing his supremacy[36], and establishing the presbyterian church; but, as he was still desirous of affording some protection to the episcopal clergy[37], the Presbyterians were still dissatisfied. The disaffection of the highland chieftains was at the same time confirmed by the massacre of Glencoe[38], which William had by his Scotish counsellors been led to authorise. A general dissatisfaction was moreover occasioned by the manifest reluctance, with which the king gave his attention to the peculiar concerns of Scotland[39].

That he might conciliate a people thus discontented, William was at length, in the year 1695, induced to express an inclination to approve any reasonable plan, for extending

[36] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 370. [37] He recommended to the general assembly to admit into parochial charges such of the episcopal clergy, as were willing to comply with the government of the church. Few of the expelled clergy having embraced the condition, an act of parliament was obtained, for allowing such of them, as should take the oaths to the king, to continue in their parishes, without being subject to the presbyteries. About seventy continued to hold their benefices under this provision.—Ibid., pp. 574, 580, 584. [38] A proclamation was issued, offering a free pardon to the highlanders, who had opposed the government, if they should take the oaths before the first day of January in the year 1692, but denouncing military execution against those who should not have complied. All the highland chiefs accordingly made their submission, except Macdonald of Glencoe, who also offered his on the last day of mercy, but was hindered by accidental circumstances from completing it within the prescribed time. He and more than thirty of his clan were massacred on account of this delay, and their valley desolated. Doctor Somerville, while he blames William for consenting to the instructions issued on this occasion, imputes the main guilt to the Scotish ministry, by which he had suffered himself to be guided.—Ibid., pp. 576, 577. App. II. "It has always been supposed," says Sir W. Scott, "that the atrocity well known by the name of the massacre of Glencoe was devised and executed to gratify at once an ancient quarrel, to silence an intractable chief, who had become clamorous about the division of the peace-offering, and to serve as a measure of intimidation to all others."—Misc. Prose Works, vol. xx. p. 57. The peace-offering was a sum of £20,000 intrusted to the earl of Bredalbane, to be distributed among the highland chiefs.—Ibid. [39] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 581.

the commerce of Scotland, and forming a colonial settlement for that part of his dominions. This expedient, though at the time it satisfied the Scots, brought upon them the most ruinous consequences. An establishment, which was immediately formed upon the isthmus of Darien, excited the apprehensions of the Spaniards[40], alarmed for their colonies in its neighbourhood; of the French, then looking to the reversion of the Spanish succession; of the English, apprehending its interference with their plantations in North America and the West Indies; and of the Dutch, who were said to carry on from Curaçoa a lucrative coasting-trade with the Spanish settlements. The court was therefore necessitated to adopt every measure for frustrating the project. The English minister at Hamburgh accordingly presented a memorial to the senate, to cut off the pecuniary assistance derived from the contributions of the merchants of that place; and the governors of the English colonies of North America and the West Indies were directed to forbid all commerce with the new settlers. Under the baleful influence of these measures three successive colonies perished by disease, famine, and the swords of the Spaniards; an almost universal bankruptcy overwhelmed the mother-country exhausted by these exertions; and the history of Scotland, from this time to the death of William, became a series of wretchedness, discontent and disorder. The public distress was aggravated by a succession of unfavourable seasons and deficient harvests, which diminished the domestic means of subsistence, while the want of commercial credit excluded a foreign supply.

All this distress and consequent dissatisfaction were however but preparatory to the incorporating union, which identified the interest of Scotland with that of England, and thus became the epoch of its prosperity. This measure had been suggested by William to the Scotish convention[41], together with the proposal of concurring in the revolution of England; but it was soon discovered to be inexpedient to embarrass the latter measure by connecting it with a proposal of so much difficulty as the former, and the consideration of it though it was twice afterwards urged by William,

[40] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 584—586. [41] Ibid., pp. 309, 310.

was reserved for the succeeding reign. Neither, amidst the distress of the nation, could the proposal of extending and confirming the settlement of the revolution, by introducing the family of Hanover into the succession, be entertained by the Scotish parliament. The act of security was after the death of William passed instead of it, providing that, after the demise of the queen, the two crowns of Great Britain should not be held by the same person, unless the independence of Scotland should have been previously secured, and its commercial interests should have been favoured by a free communication of the advantages of the English trade and colonies. The alternative being then to the English that of separation or union, to the Scots that of a turbulent and wretched independence or wealth and improvement, the incorporation of the two governments was speedily accomplished.

Most fortunately for the British empire James was either not disposed, or not enabled to take advantage of the distress and discontent of the Scots. By the French king[42], who was probably influenced by an anxiety for the success of the partition-treaty then depending, he was advised not to connect himself with the malecontents, as such a connexion would, in the increasing rancour of the two nations, render him odious to the English. The country was thus preserved from the mischiefs of foreign interference and civil war, and the gradual development of the union proceeded without interruption.

The reign, which has been examined, appears to have been the grand and interesting crisis, in which the freedom of the British government was securely established, while that government was also constituted the prime agent of the general independence. Great and glorious as is the work of regulating a single polity, so that it may minister to millions the blessings of a free and equitable government, it is little in the comparison with that, which was accomplished by the revolution of England. The protection of the general independence was no longer, as in the period of the Austrian ascendency, vested in an arbitrary government, incongruously indulging its ambition in protecting abroad the independence, which it crushed at home. It was thenceforward the work

[42] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., p. 587.

of a nation of freemen, making a common cause with the friends of national independence. The British constitution became a system at once of internal and of external liberty, securing to these countries the blessings of a free government, and guaranteeing to others all, which a foreign government could guarantee, the independence of their national existence.

CHAPTER III.

Of the history of Great Britain from the commencement of the reign of Anne, in the year 1702, *to that of George I. in the year* 1714.

Anne queen, and war with France, in the year 1702—The Scotish union, 1707—The treaty of Utrecht, 1713—Addison—Swift—Bolingbroke—Pope.

William, just six months before his death, had attained the great object of his policy, in forming the second grand alliance between Great Britain, the empire, and the Dutch states. The public mind had been brought to a persuasion, that the dearest interests of the country required a strenuous and persevering opposition to the ambition of France; and the Tories, not less than the Whigs, were compelled to seek popularity, by manifesting a disposition to give effect to the prevailing anxiety for war. The death of James II.[1], which occurred on the day preceding the conclusion of the treaty, furnished an additional and powerful excitement to the national ardour, by giving occasion to the court of France to acknowledge his son as king of England. All who were anxious for a protestant succession, were by this measure rendered devoted enemies of France, and even many, who were secretly attached to the exiled family, were alienated from their cause, when the son of James had accepted the patronage of the natural enemy of their country. The succession of the family of Hanover became accordingly from this time the common object of every party. The Tories were so deeply engaged in this rivalry of attachment to the Ha-

[1] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans., pp. 677, &c.

noverian interest, that when, in the succeeding reign, some of their leading men were disposed to favour the inclination of the queen to the succession of her brother, they were forced to pursue their object by means so clandestine and inconsistent, as frustrated their purpose, and brought ruin upon themselves.

The war waged by the former grand alliance, and concluded in the year 1697 by the treaty of Ryswick, was the process, in which the British government was opposed to France, as the balancing government in the new arrangement of the system of Europe. That of the Spanish succession which occupied the reign of Anne, and was terminated by the treaty of Utrecht, was supplementary to the former, as it transferred Spain from the house of Austria to that of Bourbon, and on the other hand united the British government with the empire, in securing a barrier for the protection of the Dutch provinces against the ambition of France.

For a period thus distinguished by a great struggle of military power, it might be thought that a warlike prince would have been the fittest agent; and yet we find that the throne of Great Britain was then occupied by a female, and of a rate of character much inferior to that of the illustrious princess, who a century before had wielded the force of Britain against the ascendency of Spain. That female however was well adapted to the crisis, in which she reigned. She was formed to be guided by the persons, who surrounded her, whatever they might be, the inferiority of her understanding subjecting her as much to the insinuations of an artful woman of her bedchamber, as to the commanding genius of Marlborough, and to the overbearing control of his high-minded consort. Under these influences the reign of a very ordinary female was ennobled by a long series of victories; and on the other hand the career of a general, whom success had never forsaken, was brought to an abrupt termination. The same reign was also, through the wisdom of lord Godolphin, distinguished by consummating a domestic revolution, which consolidated the force of the two British kingdoms. Even the sex of Anne was instrumental to the play of the two parties of the state, and to the measures of her government, as it exposed her more directly to the influence, first of the duchess of Marlborough, and then of Mrs. Masham.

The war, begun in the first year of this reign, was concluded in that, which preceded the year of the death of the queen, having been continued during eleven years. When it had been waged five years, the union of Scotland with England was accomplished. To this internal combination, which constituted a kingdom of Great Britain, attention is here to be directed.

The incorporation of the two governments of England and Scotland was an event, for which no adequate precedent could be found in the history of either country. The government of England had indeed been formed by successive incorporations. Egbert had united the Saxon heptarchy into a single monarchy, and Wales was afterwards included within its constitution. But the incorporation of the heptarchy was a work of conquest, not of legislation; nor was a real incorporation effected without the assistance of the violences of the Danes. The union of Wales was a legislative measure, but merely of the English parliament[2], and adopted long after that portion of the island had been reduced to the condition of a dependent province. The Scotish union on the other hand was, on the part of the Scots, the voluntary consent of a numerous legislature to deliver up, as it was forcibly described by lord Belhaven[3], the great object of dispute among nations, the power to manage their own affairs without assistance or control. To bring to such a renunciation a people, which boasted of an independence reaching even to a period of fabulous antiquity, and had long regarded as hostile the government inviting it to surrender that independence, required a lengthened train of causes, and a combination of favourable circumstances.

The Scots had been originally unwilling to form a connexion with the English government[4], so far as to be subject to a common sovereign[5], for they readily consented to the projected marriage of the heiress of their crown with the heir apparent of Edward I. of England. The death of

[2] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. p. 112. [3] Laing, vol. ii. p. 322.

[4] Bruce's Report on the Scotish Union, vol. i. pp. 14, 15. [5] De Foe maintains that the union then stipulated was an incorporation, and the model of that, which was afterwards concluded, in direct contradiction however to the instrument given in his own appendix.—Hist. of the Union, pp. 39, 40, 704, 705. Lond., 1786.

the princess intercepted the accomplishment of that design, and abandoned the English monarch to those measures of unwarrantable ambition, which created a lasting alienation in the minds of the Scots, and determined them to seek support in a connexion with France. The plan of a matrimonial union was, at the end of about two centuries, revived by Henry VII., who with this view gave his eldest daughter in marriage to the king of Scotland; and after another century the provident policy of that monarch was realized by the accession of James, the great-grandson of his daughter, to the throne of England.

When James took possession of the throne of England, he was eager to improve the union of the crowns into a close and intimate union of the two nations, though he did not contemplate the incorporation of their legislatures[6], but merely a mutual naturalisation and communication of privileges. Though his plan was after some time set aside, on account of the prodigality[7], with which he began to bestow upon his countrymen the favours then placed at his disposal, and of the jealousy occasioned by the irregularity of the summonses, by which he assembled his first English parliament, yet a consequence followed, which indirectly tended to effectuate an incorporating union. From the year 1607[8], in which the proposal of James was finally laid aside, the Scots appear to have tacitly enjoyed a share of the advantages of the English commerce; and the subsequent obstruction of their enjoyment of those advantages created the crisis, in which the measure was at length accomplished.

The solemn league and covenant, formed by the two nations against Charles I. of England, has been noticed as the first approach towards an intimate union[9]; and an imperfect model of an incorporation of the legislatures was first exhibited by the military dominion of Cromwell[10], who,

[6] Hist. of the Union, pp. 717, &c. [7] Bruce's Report, vol. i. pp. 36, 49, 52, 55, 65, 66. [8] Ibid., vol. i. p. 212. [9] Laing, vol. i. p. 238. [10] In the year 1305, ten persons, namely two bishops, two abbots, two earls, two barons, and two commoners, had been required by Edward I. to represent Scotland in parliament. But these persons appear to have been summoned only as commissioners, to meet twenty-two English commissioners about the settlement of the civil government of Scotland.—Parl Hist., vol. i. p. 128.

though with much irregularity, composed a common legislature, not of Great Britain only, but also of Ireland. The combination formed in this period of violence and usurpation, though temporary as the circumstances of its origin, had the effect of opening more freely to the Scots the channels of industry and commerce, and thus, like the question of naturalisation, led indirectly to the accomplishment of the union.

The usurper, in the prosecution of his plan of union favoured the communication of commercial advantages to the Scots by restraining the incorporated companies, and taking away for a time the exclusive privilege of that of India. But a legislative measure, which after the restoration was adopted and sanctioned by the parliament, had then a contrary operation, as it disjoined the commercial interest of the two countries. Even this however was eventually instrumental to the same result, for the disruption of interests, united for a time, brought the two countries at length into a relative situation so critically embarrassing, as rendered their union an arrangement indispensable to both. This was the celebrated act of navigation, a law originally dictated by hostility to the Dutch, the general carriers of the world, but maintained on account of its utility in supporting the commercial and military marine of England. So long as the Scots were identified with the English in regard to commercial advantages, they could not be affected by the restrictions of this law of exclusion; but when the re-establishment of the royal government had superseded the union effected by the usurper, while the act of navigation was retained, the people of Scotland found themselves repelled, as aliens, from that unreserved participation of the trade of England, which they had for some time enjoyed. The combined result of the temporary enjoyment and of the subsequent privation, was that the two nations at length found it necessary to put an end to the embarrassment of their relative situation by a complete and permanent union.

The Scots, under the sense of the privation, to which they were thus subjected by the act of navigation, solicited[11], though ineffectually, a commercial treaty with the English. When it had been found, that no satisfactory

[11] Bruce's Report, vol. i. pp. 213, 214.

terms of commerce could be procured from the latter, the scheme of a union was revived by the king, probably at the suggestion of the former, but with this difference from the scheme of James I.[12], that it was proposed to incorporate the two legislatures. It was however soon discovered, that the two nations were not yet prepared for this important measure. The Scots required that their entire parliament should be added to that of the English[13], a proposal alarming to the jealousy of the latter. The same resistance too of the English, which had defeated a treaty of commerce, was probably opposed to this other plan of a union, by which the object of that treaty would have been fully attained. Neither of the two nations indeed was at this time sufficiently settled in its internal arrangements, to be qualified for forming a common adjustment.

The situation of the two countries in the time of Cromwell was favourable to a union, not only because their two parliaments had been reduced to assemblies of the commons[14], so that the difficulty arising from incongruous constitutions had been removed, but also because prelacy had been alike suppressed in both. In the time of Charles II., besides that the two discordant parliamentary constitutions had been restored, prelacy had been re-established in England, and attempts were made to establish it also in Scotland. These attempts had no other operation, than that of exasperating the zeal of the Scots for the contrary system. In the reigns of the two earlier princes of the family of the Stuarts, episcopacy had provoked the spirit, by which the constitution of England was overturned in the civil wars; and in those of the two later it aroused the resistance, which finally decided the Scots to become associates in the revolution of England. Scotland was placed by these attempts in an unnatural and forced state, through the whole of the period, which elapsed between the restoration and the revolution. An incorporating union therefore, which

[12] Bruce's Report, vol. i. p. 323. [13] Ibid., p. 227.

[14] Both the united parliaments, summoned by Cromwell, had been assembled before he attempted to form a house of lords. The first of these parliaments was assembled in the year 1653, and the second in the year 1654; the writs were issued for assembling a house of lords in the year 1657.—Parl. Hist., vol. xx. pp. 152, 316; vol. xxi. p. 165.

would have permanently ascertained the ecclesiastical system of Scotland, was during that time incompatible with the order and tranquillity of that country. If on the other hand it be considered, that the revolution of England was effected by a combination of the established church with the Presbyterians, it must appear that, before this combination had resulted from the tyranny and bigotry of James II., neither was England prepared for receiving into its legislature an infusion of Scotish contention.

These considerations present a curious correspondence between the retardation of the union of the two crowns, and the subsequent retardation of the incorporating union of the two legislatures. If the death of the Scotish princess had not hindered the accomplishment of the marriage, projected for his son by Edward I. of England, and eventually postponed more than three centuries the union of the crowns, it is probable that the reformation of Scotland would have resembled that of England, and the former would not have been prepared by a presbyterian system to act upon the domestic discontents of the latter in the civil war. If, in the other case, Charles II. had been able to accomplish an incorporating union, Scotland, it must be supposed, would have been permanently subjected to an ecclesiastical establishment abhorrent from the prevalent sentiments of the people, and therefore fitted only to bring into a common legislature the domestic discontent of that country.

The advancement of William to the throne was speedily followed by the suppression of that episcopacy, which the Stuarts had laboured to establish in Scotland; and the presbyterian system was established in its place, the revolution having been in that kingdom the work of the Presbyterians alone, and not, as in England, the result of a coalition of parties. Scotland was therefore by the revolution brought into a situation, in which it might become an orderly and tranquil member of a common government. The Scots too had, in their embarrassed and distressing circumstances, become so desirous of a union, that in their answer to the exhortation[15], which William had addressed to them in his very first communication, they offered to refer to his arbitrement all the difficulties, which might arise in the negotiation,

[15] Bruce's Report, vol. ii. p. 335.

reserving only their newly-recovered system of presbyterianism. The English however had not yet become sensible of the expediency of admitting the neighbouring people to a participation of their commercial advantages, and therefore declined to notice that part of the king's speech, which had recommended a union to their consideration. William pressed the adoption of his plan, in his anxiety to concentrate as soon as possible the resources of his new dominions, that he might oppose a more formidable resistance to the ambition of France. This however appears to have been reserved for the more decisive operations of the second grand alliance, which were conducted by the duke of Marlborough.

The proposal of William, though it failed to produce its intended effect, had however its operation in promoting indirectly the success of the measure. The Scots, convinced by the tacit rejection of the treaty in the English parliament[16], that they could not hope to be exempted by any accommodation from the restrictions, under which their commerce had languished since the restoration, resolved to form commercial establishments for themselves, and with this design passed an act for incorporating a company, which should trade to Africa and the East Indies. Being compelled by the opposition of the English company to relinquish the project of a direct trade to the East Indies[17], they then formed a scheme for making a settlement in Darien[18], purporting to render it the emporium of a commercial intercourse, to be maintained with the Spanish West Indies on the one hand, and with the East Indies on the other. Here they interfered with the Spaniards, who prepared to resist the new settlers by force, and required the English government to prohibit its colonists to furnish them with any assistance. They were at the same time more effectually obstructed by the efforts, which the English company exerted to embarrass

16 Bruce's Report, vol. i. pp. 236, 238. 17 Ibid., p. 241.

18 The colony, which was named New Caledonia, was settled near the mouth of the river Darien, the point at which a communication between the two seas seems to be most practicable, as from the bay of Cupica, on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, the communication by water with a navigable river, flowing into the Atrata or Darien, is interrupted only by a space of five or six leagues of level country, proper for a canal.—Edinb. Rev., April, 1810.

their funds. These enterprises, having been unsuccessful, were not sufficient to lead the English to a renunciation of their commercial jealousy[19]. The discussion of the treaty therefore in the commencement of the reign of Anne, though it proceeded to a considerable degree of detail, and evidently prepared the way for the final arrangement of the measure[20], proved abortive, like those which had preceded. An expedient of a formidable character was therefore necessary for removing a prepossession so natural, and so deeply rooted. Such an expedient was soon provided in the Scotish act of security, which presented to the English the alternative of favouring the trade of Scotland[21], or of dissolving that union of the crowns, by which the two kingdoms had during a century been subjected to a common sovereign. The crisis had then arrived, which had been remotely prepared by the efforts of James I., by the union of Cromwell, and by the navigation-act of Charles II. The commercial jealousy of the English nation gave way before a consideration, affecting the dignity of the crown and the safety of the kingdom; and an incorporating union put an end for ever to the contention, by combining the people of the two countries in the common enjoyment of all the advantages of English commerce.

It must not however be supposed, that the Scots themselves had not even at this time their own jealousies opposed to such a measure, so that the plan should have encountered no difficulty in the northern part of the island. To surrender the pride of maintaining a distinct and independent govern-

[19] Bruce's Report, vol. i. p. 269. [20] 'The great outlines of the treaty were now drawn, and the general principles of it established; and as the same persons were afterwards appointed commissioners for that purpose, they had, during the interval between these two transactions, directed their thoughts and inquiries to the most proper expedients for removing the difficulties and misunderstandings, which impeded their progress at this time.'—Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 161. [21] This act provided, that the successor to the crown of Scotland should not be the same with the successor to the crown of England, unless such conditions of government should be established, as might secure the honour and sovereignty of the crown of Scotland, the freedom, frequency, and power of parliaments, and the religion, liberty, and trade of the nation, from English, or any-foreign influence Though it was superseded by the union, it was thought necessary to abrogate it by a formal statute after that event.

ment; to consent to a reduction of the number of the legislature at the very time, when it was to be incorporated with the more numerous legislature of an almost hostile people; and to subject Scotland to a proportion of the heavy and increasing burdens of English taxation, when the country was destitute of resources, and ruined by the recent failure of its efforts to provide some commercial means of relief: these were concessions sufficiently alarming, not only to array against the measure the prejudices and passions of the multitude, but also to kindle to enthusiasm the pathetic eloquence of a Belhaven[22], and to provoke the virtuous and honourable, though eccentric and ill-regulated patriotism, of a Fletcher.

For understanding how this difficulty was at length surmounted, it is necessary to reflect on the heterogeneous nature of the parliamentary opposition, by which it was resisted. Composed of Jacobites, who still cherished the hope of reestablishing on the throne the family of their native princes, and of a country-party, which professed an anxiety to combine a protestant succession with the independence and prosperity of Scotland, it was incapable of maintaining that unyielding steadiness, which was indispensable to its success. It was accordingly found to be practicable to detach from the opposition a portion, which bore the name of the *squadrone volante*[23], and affected to hold the balance between the opposition and the court. This defection decided the struggle[24]. The imperfect constitution of the parliament facilitated the triumph of the government. The peers, many of whom had been ennobled in the actual reign[25], and whose entire number was nearly equal to that of the commons[26], composed with the latter a single house of parliament, and furnished a powerful support to the crown in the common decision.

[22] The gloomy anticipations of lord Belhaven were, ninety-two years afterwards, refuted by his countryman Mr. Dundas, in a speech concerning the union of Ireland. [23] This body was composed of the members of an administration dismissed at this crisis, as they refused to adhere to the opposition, which had deserted them, or to the court, by which they had been dismissed.—Laing, vol. ii. p. 288. Among the peers, who received money for supporting the union, were four leaders of the *squadrone*.—Ibid., p. 327. [24] Ibid., p. 326.
[25] Ibid. [26] The commons were a hundred and sixty, the peers a hundred and forty-five.—Ibid., p. 307, note.

On a parliament thus constituted, and indeed on the people at large, the government employed the influence of a considerable sum of money, nearly four hundred thousand pounds[27], stipulated in the treaty as the equivalent due to Scotland, for becoming subject to taxes appropriated to the payment of the debt of England. The union rendering it necessary to suppress the African or Indian company of Scotland, this money was applied, not only to the discharge of the public debts of that kingdom, but also to the repayment of the stock of the company with interest. The residue was to be employed in compensating individuals for losses, sustained from the reduction of the coin to the standard of England, and in encouraging the fisheries, manufactures, and other improvements of that part of the island. A more immediate effect was produced by the payment of a much smaller sum[28], about twenty thousand pounds, which had been remitted from England for the purpose of procuring a majority in the parliament. Out of this very moderate sum money was distributed among twenty-two peers and eight commoners, besides an allowance, exceeding the half of it, granted to the earl of Glasgow, the commissioner, for his expenses; and of this number every individual except one, whose case might have been in some respect peculiar, voted for the measure. While every honest mind must be pained at the necessity of resorting to such means for attaining a beneficial object, the political speculator cannot fail to reflect, that the surprising smallness of the bribes is a striking indication of the poverty of Scotland, and of the advantage, which it must have received by being incorporated with a country so much more opulent.

Among the causes which favoured the union in Scotland, was the contingency of an unusually severe season. It was

[27] 398,085*l.*, 10*s*.—De Foe, p. 175. [28] The largest payment was 1104*l.* 15*s.* 7*d.*, made to the earl of Marchmont, the chief leader of the *squadrone;* the least was of 11*l.* 2*s.*, made to the lord Bamf. Of all who received this money, the duke of Athol, who received 1000*l.* alone did not vote for the union. Of the entire sum, which was 20,540*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.*, the sum of 12,325*l.* was allowed to the commissioner, the earl of Glasgow, for equipage and daily expenses; and 60*l.* to the messenger, who brought the treaty. The sums distributed by the commissioner amounted therefore only to 8155*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.*—Lockart's Memoirs of Scotland, appendix. Dublin, 1799.

the opinion of Lockart[29], who was adverse to the measure, that if the parliament had not sat in the winter, and the weather had not been more than ordinarily tempestuous, the nation could not have been hindered from rising against its own legislature, and destroying those, who were willing to concede its independence. Other causes influenced the parliament; this restrained the people.

That the act of security, which threatened the separation of the two kingdoms, should have received the assent of the queen, has been explained by a consideration of the difficulties of the time[30]. A large arrear of pay was due to the Scotish army, the provision for discharging which was by the parliament connected with this very measure. Nor had those splendid successes been then obtained by the English, which afterwards inspired the nation with a confidence in its own strength, and might have caused it to disregard the discontent of the Scots. When however the treaty of union was negotiated, the victories of Ramillies and Turin had animated the English with a cheerful feeling of triumph, which, though it would not have yielded anything to intimidation, disposed them to concede everything necessary for relieving the apprehensions[31], and conciliating the prejudices, of a people no longer formidable. It has been also stated with much probability[32], that lord Godolphin, the English minister, perceived the tendency of the act of security to promote the union, and with this view advised the queen to give her assent.

Thus was at length accomplished[33] the consolidation of the two governments of Great Britain, four centuries after Edward had projected their connexion, and one century after the accession of James to the throne of England had realized the project of Edward. The union of the crowns had delivered both nations from the miseries of a border-war, and had secured England in particular from that exposure to the arms of France, to which it had been subject during the

[29] Lockart's Memoirs of Scotland, p. 218. [30] Laing, vol. ii. pp. 282, 283. Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 617. [31] Ibid., p. 222. [32] Ibid., p. 617. [33] By the treaty sixteen peers were to be elected by the peers for each parliament to represent them in the house of lords, and forty-five representatives of counties and boroughs were to be sent to the house of commons, of which thirty were to be elected by the counties.

separate existence of the Scotish government. But each government then became exposed to a danger of a different kind, which could be averted only by the incorporation of the legislatures. The sovereign of two separate kingdoms might render either of them the instrument of establishing his power over the other, and the opportunity was tried against each by the princes of the family of the Stuarts. The experiment was first tried against Scotland; and, though in the struggle the constitution of England was destroyed, and the sovereign was brought to the block, yet the last of these princes brought the Scotish parliament to acknowledge his absolute power, realising this acknowledgment by renouncing the control of the supplies, and devoting to his service every individual capable of bearing arms. The slavery of Scotland was then to be employed in the subjugation of the liberty of England, but the revolution intercepted this other calamity, and prepared the salutary crisis of an incorporating union. If England was by this measure freed from the necessity of fighting for its liberty against a Scotish army, Scotland was on the other hand rescued from the pernicious influence of the superior power and wealth of England, and enabled to advance in improvement and opulence without any undue interference of the neighbouring people.

The representation of Scotland was not indeed strictly conformable to the constitution of England. Agreeably to the imperfect system, which had previously existed, the right of voting in counties[34] continued to be limited to the immediate vassals of the crown, instead of being extended, as in England and Ireland, to the inferior possessors of freeholds. This portion of the representation therefore rests upon a narrower basis. Neither is that its only defect, for it is also, by a very peculiar practice, loosened even from that basis, since the right of voting may[35], under the name of a *superiority*, be separated from the actual possession of the land, and in this manner be transferred from one person to another.

[34] In Sutherland it was found necessary to authorise subvassals to vote by a special act of parliament, on account of the small number of immediate vassals. [35] The late professor Millar of Glasgow informed the author, that in his time the number of voters in all the counties was about two thousand, the half of which consisted of persons holding these *superiorities*.

To judge of the bearing of this imperfection on the united legislature, it should be considered, that Scotland had been the source of that active spirit of independence, which once overturned the government of England; that the same party, by which so much confusion had been caused, was restored to power by the revolution, after a long period of persecution and exasperation; and that the settlement of the protestant succession, which was involved in the union, removed from them that fear of the ascendency of the Jacobites, by which they had since the revolution been restrained. Agitated as Scotland had been ever since the reformation, the imperfect representation of the counties of Scotland fortunately furnished a counteracting principle to the dangerous excitement, and rendered their portion of the house of commons the most passive members of the legislature.

Nor was the tranquillity of the presbyterian party of Scotland left solely to the influence of its very imperfect representation. A more direct and comprehensive expedient was employed for this purpose, in restoring the right of patronage over the selection of the parochial ministers. This right was coeval with the reformation[36], nor was the choice of the ministers determined by popular election before the death of Charles I. Soon after the restoration it was revived[37], and it subsisted until the revolution, from which time the choice was again, though with some reservation[38], transferred to the people. The regulation of William was not repealed by the treaty of union, but five years afterwards the original right of patronage was again estab-

[36] Laing, vol. ii. pp. 217, 218. [37] Ibid., p. 21.

[38] 'The rights of patronage were purchased by the parishes at an inconsiderable rate, and the ministers proposed by the elders and landholders, were approved or rejected by the congregation at large. Their dissent was reviewed by the presbytery, and as the elders were ever more numerous than the landlords, the influence of the clergy never failed to turn the election. But the clergy were not thereby relieved from the necessity of low assentation; on the contrary their influence over the people induced them to cultivate the most popular arts; grace and zeal were invariably preferred to moderation and learning; and to determine the choice of a fanatical people, it was necessary that the clergy should become fanatics themselves. Their fanaticism reacted on each other, while the king was deprived of the influence of the patrons to prevent the expulsion of the episcopal, and to restrain or temper the intolerance of the presbyterian clergy.'—Ibid., p. 218.

lished by an act of the united parliament. By this measure, says a Scotish historian[39], the clergy were relieved from the necessity of that low assentation, which cherished both in themselves, and in their congregations, a gloomy and intolerant fanaticism; a valuable testimony to the political utility of the regulation.

One only peculiarity of the condition of Scotland remains to be noticed, especially interesting in a commercial age. It has been observed that the practice of entails, which had long before been evaded in England, was introduced into Scotland, for the first time, in the reign of James II., with the design of protecting the families of the nobility from the forfeiture of their properties to the tyranny of that king, and that by this practice more than a fifth, or even a third part of the lands, is excluded from commerce. That the improvement of Scotish commerce is obstructed by the restriction is obvious. It may however well be questioned, whether such a restriction be prejudicial to the empire, whether, as Johnson thought of the peculiarities of the highland clans[40], the gallantry of the feudal habits of Scotland should not in this other instance be held in reserve for the exigencies of national security. Commerce is good; but safety and independence, without which even that commerce could not prosper, are yet more important.

Anne survived the union seven years, which were occupied partly by the prosecution of the war with France, partly by that struggle of domestic parties, which in the year preceding her death displaced the ministry of the Whigs, and thus gave occasion to the treaty of Utrecht. To the Tories the Queen had been originally attached[41], influenced partly by the tuition of Compton, the bishop of London, partly by the steady adherence of that party to her interest, manifested particularly by their successful efforts in procuring for her, in the late reign, an independent revenue. This predilection was however soon overruled by the influence of the wife of Marlborough[42], probably actuated by some personal resentments. From this time the ministry became gradually inclined more and more to

39 Laing. vol. ii. p. 362. 40 Journey to the Western Highlands, p. 145. Dublin, 1775. 41 Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, p. 2. 42 Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 281—283.

the Whigs, until, in the year 1708, they became possessed of the whole power of the government, which they held until the year 1710, when the suggestions of Mrs. Masham another favourite, originally introduced by the former, turned the mind of the queen, dismissed the victorious general from his career of triumph, brought[43] the Tories into the administration, and terminated the war of the grand alliance. By the treaty then concluded, while the balance of the new system of general policy was adjusted, the domestic arrangement of the British government was also guaranteed, the king of France having become bound to adhere to the protestant settlement of the British crown.

To this period, which engaged the British people as a principal power in the great struggle of nations, belong naturally the writers, who have most improved both the prose and the poetry of its language. In the reign of Anne were published by Addison those *Spectators*, which have given unaffected elegance to the former, and refinement and virtue to the manners of society. In the same reign were presented to the world[44] much of those writings, by which Swift established a standard for the simplicity and purity of the English tongue, though it was in the succeeding one that he awakened the spirit of Irish patriotism by the *Draper's Letters*, and concluded his literary course with satirizing his species in the *Travels of Gulliver*. In this reign[45] also was the English language improved to that de-

[43] The queen and the public were disposed to this change by the reaction consequent to the trial and conviction of doctor Sacheverell, who was in the year 1709 impeached by the commons for advocating tory principles.—Somerville's Hist. of Queen Anne, pp. 371—382.

[44] "Although his political treatises raised his fame when published, and are still read as excellent models of that species of composition, it is to his *Tale of a Tub*, to the *Battle of the Books*, to his moral romance of *Gulliver*, and to his smaller, but not less exquisite satires upon men and manners, that Swift owes the extent and permanency of his popularity as an English classic of the first rank."—Mem. of Swift by Sir W. Scott, p. 436. Edinb. 1834. [45] Hist. of England by Lord Mahon, vol. i. pp. 38, 39. "It (the style of Bolingbroke) displays all the power and richness of the English language; and, in all its changes, never either soars into bombast, or sinks into vulgarity. —The former (Mr. Burke) as is well known, had so closely embued himself with it, that his first publication was a most ingenious, and, to many persons, deceptive imitation of its manner. To Mr. Pitt it was

gree of perfection by Bolingbroke, that his style was the study and model of the two greatest minds of the succeeding generation, Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt, though on account of its misapplication, especially in maintaining the cause of infidelity, his writings have fallen into neglect. It was in the reign of Anne too, that Pope enriched the literature of his country with the earlier of those poetical compositions, which have given the last perfection to the heroic measure of Dryden. To attempt any further improvement of English versification has been by Johnson pronounced to be dangerous; and accordingly the great poets of our own time have abandoned the heroic couplet, and sought in other metres new means of affording gratification. Among these lord Byron[46] has distinctly acknowledged the superiority of Pope to all his successors. When Newton and Locke had illustrated their country by the profoundest researches of philosophy, the distinguished writers, who have been mentioned, added the graces of composition to the language, by which the philosophy of Great Britain was to be communicated to the world and to posterity.

recommended by the example and advice of his illustrious father, who, in one of his letters, observes of *Oldcastle's Remarks*, that they 'should be studied, and almost got by heart, for the inimitable beauty of the style.' Mr. Pitt, accordingly, early read, and often recurred to, these political writings; and he has several times stated in conversation to the present lord Stanhope, that there was scarcely any loss in literature, which he so deeply deplored, as that no adequate record of Bolingbroke's speeches should remain."—Ibid. [46] 'With regard to poetry in general, I am convinced, the more I think of it, that he and all of us—Scott, Southey, Wordsworth, Moore, Campbell and I—are all in the wrong, one as much as another.—I took Moore's poems and my own and some others, and went over them side by side with Pope's, and I was really astonished (I ought not to have been so) and mortified at the ineffable distance in point of sense, learning, effect, and even imagination, passion, and invention, between the little Queen Anne's man and us of the Lower Empire. Depend upon it, it is all Horace then, and Claudian now among us; and if I had to begin again, I would mould myself accordingly.'—Moore's Life of Lord Byron, vol. ii. p. 147. Lond. 1830.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the history of the northern governments of Europe, from the peace of Oliva[1] *in the year* 1660 *to the peace of Nystadt, in the year* 1721.

Anarchy of Poland; John Sobieski king; in the year 1672—Ivan V. and Peter I. czars, 1682—Peter I. sole czar, 1689—Monarchy absolute in Sweden, 1680—Charles XII. king of Sweden, 1697—Poland, Russia, and Denmark at war with Sweden, 1700—Peace of Nystadt, and suppression of the patriarchate of Russia, 1721.

THE four northern governments of Europe, Poland, Russia, Denmark, and Sweden, are now to be reviewed to the conclusion of the treaty of Nystadt between Russia and Sweden in the year 1721, from which transaction Russia assumed among them a decided ascendency. The treaty of Nystadt appears to have been for these states an arrangement corresponding to that of Utrecht for the southern governments, the former having given the predominance to Russia, as the latter did to France, though with this important inferiority of the northern system, that it contained no balancing power, while in the other an equilibrium was maintained against France by the British government.

The northern system seems to have been but an apparatus for preparing a great power, to be afterwards exercised in re-establishing the independence of the governments of the south, and probably in entering with them afterwards into some larger and more general combination of federative policy. That power was Russia, to the aggrandisement of which the three other governments of the north have been directly, or indirectly, instrumental. Poland was early connected with Russia in very intimate relations, which it continued to maintain; Sweden acted upon Russia by the strong excitement of a formidable invasion; and Denmark performed its part, by being instrumental to the due formation of that Swedish government, which stimulated the energies

[1] The northern governments not having observed the same division of periods, as those of the south, it has been necessary to commence the discussion contained in this chapter, from a time preceding by twenty-eight years the British revolution, which is the epoch of the present book.

of Russia. The northern system, thus constituted, appears to have been of a prospective character, a provision made for the crisis, which should at the close of the eighteenth century dissolve the more perfect system of the south. This consideration presents a wide and various view of the moral government of the world. It seems to be characteristic of a divine providence alone, that at the very time, in which one period of the history of human policy was commenced, a collateral organization should be formed, to grow into maturity for another century, when a new and powerful agency should be required in the altered circumstances of the world, and a new period of its history should be begun.

While the Germanic constitution was gradually losing its federative character, and resolving itself into the two sovereignties of Austria and Prussia with their dependent states, the neighbouring, but exterior government, of Poland, more remote from the centre of the system, and on that account more imperfect in its organization[2], was experiencing a continual deterioration, not mitigated by any advantage of a new form. Amidst a combination of circumstances eminently unfavourable to the stability of the government, a numerous aristocracy had become armed with a political importance, which was destructive at once of the prerogatives of the crown, of the rights of the people, and of the public order and tranquillity. The government of Poland, if it continued to merit the name, was thenceforward a mob of armed nobles, refractory to their sovereign, and oppressive to their vassals. The heroism of Sobieski threw a temporary splendour over his declining country; but the nation continued to sink into political decay, until it ceased to maintain a separate existence among the states of Europe.

For the ultimate dissolution of the state of Poland it might indeed have been sufficient, that it should not have

[2] Representative government, which had been introduced in England in the year 1265, in Germany in the year 1292, in France in the year 1303, in Scotland in the year 1306, and in Spain towards the year 1350, was in Poland introduced so late as in the year 1467. It was also there peculiarly imperfect; first, because the practice of assembling the whole body of a very numerous nobility was still retained on all occasions of moment; and secondly, because the commons, never having been enfranchised, had no share in the representation.—Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne par Rulhière, tome i. p. 27.

participated the improvements of the surrounding nations, as it must have yielded to their ascendency, and in some manner or other have ceased to exist. That country however had not merely remained unamended, but had even tended towards anarchy, while the surrounding governments were improving their institutions, so that the confirmed disorder of Poland was in its commencement contemporary to the beginning of a regular policy in the neighbouring nations[3], as if to facilitate usurpations, which might otherwise have been too slowly effected. Though the moralist, and even the enlightened politician, must ever protest against the fatal precedent of unauthorised aggression, yet he who observes the ordinary operation of human passions, must regard the erasure of such a community from the list of nations as an event in the natural order of political revolutions, and the philosopher may speculate on it as a part of that great and various combination of occurrences, which evinces the unity of the administration of a providential government.

That dissolution, towards which Poland thus naturally tended, has been considered by politicians as the particular transaction, which began the ruin of the system of balanced policy, established in Europe. The principle of balanced policy is that the weaker powers confederate to resist the encroachments of the strong. The partition of Poland was the result of a combination of the stronger powers to take advantage of the inferiority of the weak, and may therefore be fairly regarded as having broken up the former. Among the northern governments accordingly, while Russia was receiving that aggrandisement, which should prepare it to bear a principal part in the combinations succeeding the existing system, Poland was prepared to occasion the dissolution of the system, and thus to make a way for the operations of the great empire of the north.

The feeble sovereign of Poland, in whose reign the peace of Oliva had decided the declension of that country, found himself unable to sustain the cares of royalty amidst the

[3] Rulhière has named the year 1673 as the epoch of its most irremediable anarchy.—Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne, tome i. p. 67. This he has described as effected in the compromise of the two factions of the higher and lower nobility, which preceded the election of Sobieski, each acquiescing in the abuses of the other.—Ibid., p. 65.

distractions of a government so tumultuary, which raged with even greater fury on the restoration of external tranquillity[4], and accordingly resigned the crown about eight years after the conclusion of the treaty. The interregnum, which then succeeded, exhibited in all its violence the disorder of the state. The nobles assembled by squadrons in the field of election[5]; and those, who had been appointed to guard the inclosure, in which the election was held, impatient of the indecision of the senate, discharged their muskets on those very superiors, whom they had been stationed there to protect. In this crisis of extreme embarrassment a prince was elected, who had indeed sprung from the family, which had long occupied the throne of Poland, but, being destitute even of an independent subsistence[6], was incapable of arresting the calamities of his country. Astonished at his own election, and conscious of his unfitness, Michael deprecated even with tears the dangerous pre-eminence[7]. The same spirit of resistance to the pretensions of foreign candidates however, which had dictated the choice of this nobleman[8], determined the electors to persist, and he was necessitated to acquiesce. His reign, which lasted about four years and a half, was as weak and inglorious, as an election in such circumstances portended. It served however to bring forward the celebrated Sobieski.

This distinguished man, who was then the grand marshal of Poland, indignant at the disgraceful submission of his sovereign to the rebellious Cossacks, and their allies the Turks, availed himself of a favourable opportunity for vindicating the honour of his country. On the day preceding that, on which Sobieski gained a brilliant victory over the enemies of Poland, the throne had become vacant by the death of the incapable Michael. The crisis was favourable to the pretensions of the victorious general, and, though the votes of the Polish nobles were solicited by ten foreign candidates of distinguished rank[9], who all endeavoured to purchase the election, the gallant Sobieski was rewarded with the crown, which he had avenged, and was thus enabled to bestow upon the decaying royalty a momentary

[4] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. du Nord, tome ii. p. 612. [5] Ibid., pp. 613. 614. [6] Ibid., p. 616. [7] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. de Pologne, p. 255. [8] Ibid., pp. 244, 245. [9] Ibid., p. 264.

dignity. In the reign of this prince occurred the great struggle between the house of Austria and the Turks for the dominion of Hungary, and to this Polish sovereign was Vienna indebted for its deliverance, when the emperor had abandoned it to its fate.

It so happened that this hero of his time was notwithstanding the slave of his wife[10], whose cabinet is described as the tomb of the laws and of liberty. Such a reign accordingly, glorious as it was abroad, maintained at home that series of disorder, which had distracted the government of preceding princes, the foreign and domestic interests of the state being administered as if by two sovereigns the most directly contrasted. While the military genius of Sobieski ennobled the history of his country by his successful interposition for the deliverance of the imperial capital, the growing anarchy of that country advanced to its maturity[11], as if the sceptre were swayed by a feeble and incapable monarch. The heroism of this prince had however completed the defence of Christendom against the Turks. Their empire had received a blow, from which it was unable to recover itself; and the peace of Carlowitz, concluded three years after his death, sealed its degradation from the rank, in which it had long been formidable to Germany, Poland, and Russia. This having been effected, the subsequent relations of Poland were limited to the internal interests of Christian Europe.

At the death of a prince so distinguished for military genius, it might not have been difficult for his eldest son to secure his own election, if the same intriguing spirit of the queen, which had disturbed the reign of the father, had not also blasted the hope of the son. The queen, in her partiality for her second son, having exerted all her influence to counteract the efforts of the elder, neither was elected, and the crown was transferred to a foreign prince, Augustus elector of Saxony. From the election of this prince to the death of his son and successor Augustus III., elapsed a period of seventy years. It therefore becomes important to enquire, what were the bearings of the advancement of this Saxon family to the throne of Poland. It appears to have

[10] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. de Pologne, p. 291. [11] Hist. of Poland, p. 211.

had two distinct relations, one to the German empire, of which this family held an electorate, the other to its new dominion.

The relation of this event to the German empire appears to have consisted in inducing the elector, who had been the chief of the Protestants of Germany, to conform to the religion of Rome, and thus to abdicate in effect the presidency of the Protestants. When it shall be considered that, soon after this time, the aggrandisement of Prussia presented a new and more powerful leader, to maintain the opposition to the power of Austria, it may be thought, that the apostasy of the Saxon prince, which was required as a condition of his election to the throne of Poland, effected a seasonable removal of a troublesome competition. This prince indeed was permitted to retain the formal presidency of the protestant party in the diets of the empire[12], having entered into engagements for the security of the protestant religion; but the king of Prussia became the real leader, and the power of Prussia the effectual protection of the party.

To Poland the same event became the epoch of the ascendency[13], which Russia acquired over this unfortunate country. The Saxon princes introduced habits of luxurious enjoyment, which softened without refining, and formed to submission and dependence a tumultuary people; and their present interests, disposing them to seek from Russia protection against the power of Sweden, afforded to that government a favourable opportunity for establishing a control over the internal concerns of Poland. Augustus II., in the very commencement of his reign began the connexion with Russia, for recovering from Sweden the part of Livonia, which that government had wrested from his new country, probably influenced by a desire of having in that enterprise a pretext for retaining in Poland an army of ten thousand Saxons, which at his coronation he had sworn to send back into Saxony. So much was the connexion strengthened in the ensuing reign, that the minister of Augustus III. has been represented as notoriously the slave of Russia.

The feeling of an independent spirit must be pained by this degradation of a people, which had been so recently

[12] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 434. [13] Mably, tome xiii. pp. 11, 12, 30, 32. Rulhière, tome. i. p. 74.

distinguished by the gallantry manifested in the deliverance of the empire; but when it shall have been considered that, at the election of the earlier of those Saxon sovereigns[14], the royalty had been shamelessly exposed to sale, and was actually given for the ready money of Saxony, in preference to the promises of France, we must be forced to regard that people as not fitted for a better fate. It is a curious specimen of the election, that some votes were procured at the very moderate expense of a crown with a little brandy for each nobleman.

The government of Denmark within the same period was the most perfectly contrasted to that of Poland, which could be imagined. Immediately after the conclusion of the treaty of Oliva, the agitations of that country were terminated by a formal surrender of all the authority of the state into the hands of the sovereign. While therefore Poland was continually advancing further into that licentious disorder, in which she was at length exposed an easy prey to the surrounding potentates, Denmark became wholly exempted from the struggles of faction, and enabled to exercise her whole power upon Sweden her ancient rival.

It was the good fortune of the Danes to enjoy the advantage of the unity of an arbitrary government, without experiencing much of the inconveniences, with which it is commonly attended. Frederic III., for whose heroism in the extreme danger of the state the people had entertained such veneration, that they compelled the nobles to join with them in investing him with absolute authority, continued during ten years to secure by the mild beneficence of his government that affection[15], which he had conciliated by unshaken fortitude. His son Christian V. was worthy to succeed such a prince, and his reign was the period of the internal improvement of Denmark. This prince took care to modify the simplicity of an absolute government by instituting various privileged orders[16]; he published codes of law for the regulation of his two kingdoms; he made every exertion within his power for the encouragement of manufacturing industry and commerce; and he procured for the marine of

[14] Hist. of Poland, pp. 235, 236, 242. Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. de Pologne, p. 306. [15] Mallet, tome ix. pp. 144, 145. [16] Ibid., pp. 296, &c.

his country a distinction, which it had never before possessed. The historian of Denmark, who lived half-a-century after the death of this sovereign, tells us that his memory was at that time still cherished with an enthusiastic affection. His plans were prosecuted by his son and successor Frederic IV.[17], who, like his father, bequeathed a respected name to posterity.

To form a judgment of the bearing of the Danish government, we must in this period, as in that which preceded, direct our attention to Sweden. Of these two lesser monarchies of the Baltic, Sweden was that which acted on the general interests of Europe, in the German war by supporting the Protestants against the emperor, and in this later period by exciting the energies of Russia; Denmark on the other hand was important to the general system, chiefly as it was instrumental in modifying that more directly influential government.

Though the Danes felt some inquietude in regard to their neighbours of Sweden[18], and were even necessitated to gratify them with some commercial indulgences, fifteen years elapsed from the conclusion of the treaty of Oliva, before hostilities were again commenced between those neighbouring states, and even then the war appears to have been excited principally by the extended influence of the ambitious enterprise of Louis XIV. for the conquest of the Dutch provinces[19]. Sweden, agreeably to the connexion formed in the German war, was the ally of France; and Denmark, with the contrary policy, espoused the cause of the Dutch.

The neighbouring monarchy, instead of enjoying the benefits of a mild and improving government, concentrated in the authority of a sovereign, was, even to the commencement of hostilities, ruled by a regency acting in the name of a child, Charles II. The struggle however[20], which lasted four years, effected for Sweden a revolution, similar to that which, twenty years before, had been by the hostility of Sweden effected for Denmark. As the former war, in which Sweden had reduced her rival to very great distress, had in Denmark, by humbling the aristocracy, given to the sovereign the uncontrolled direction of the state, so the latter, which was the re-action of this revolution, pressed with

[17] Mallet, tome ix. pp. 422, 423, 441. [18] Ibid., p. 144. [19] Ibid., pp. 165, 166. [20] Puffendorf, tome iii. pp. 60, &c.

a similar influence upon Sweden, enfeebled at once by the imperfection of its constitution, and by the long minority of its prince. Causes were in this manner brought into action in the latter country, nearly similar to those, which had previously effected a revolution in the former; and what was deficient in the personal ability of the sovereign, was compensated by the example of success.

The remainder of the reign of Charles XI., who survived this revolution seventeen years, was employed in financial arrangements, oppressive in their operation[21], but tending to extricate the government from difficulties, by which it had been embarrassed. He was then succeeded by his son Charles XII., in whose reign we discover the result of the Swedish revolution. The government of Sweden appears to have been braced to its utmost tension in preparation for his coming; and the agent was then brought forward, who seems to have been of all men the most fitted to urge its collected power into the most violent, though necessarily a brief exertion. A brief, but violent exertion, was sufficient for stimulating the energies of Russia. When this had been effected, the Swedish monarchy, exhausted by the effort, settled into a subordinate situation, as one of the minor governments of the north.

We may here observe a remarkable contrast between the spirit of the government, which followed the revolution of Sweden, and that of the government, which had succeeded the similar revolution of Denmark. In the latter a mild and parental attention to the welfare of the nation, continued through a succession of princes, would almost dispose us to forget, that man was not framed to be directed like a child, and reconcile us to the narcotic influence of arbitrary government. In the former, violent changes of the value of the coin and the fraudulent discharge of the public debt thereby effected, were the most conspicuous effects of the transfer of all the authority of the constitution to the sovereign. This difference was however well accommodated to the difference of the relations of the two governments. For qualifying Sweden to make a powerful, though transitory impression, on the Russian empire, it was necessary that the resources of the country should, with whatever violence, be

[21] Puffendorf, tome iii. pp. 65, &c.

placed at the uncontrolled disposal of the sovereign; but Denmark was in a great degree withdrawn from the struggle, and a permanent system of beneficent administration was best adapted to the almost neutral position, in which it was thenceforward placed.

The same violent spirit of the Swedish government, which collected its resources for the military exertions of Charles XII., provided also the occasion, which drew the young prince into action, and astonished the states of Europe with the energy of his character. The resumption of the demesnes of the crown, which had been found advantageous to the royal power in its application to Sweden, was extended to Livonia[22], the field of contention for the powers of the north. A measure in itself so full of alarm, was in this distant province rendered more generally irritating[23], by being applied to all the demesnes which had passed into the hands of the nobles, either from the military order formerly possessed of Livonia, or from the ecclesiastics. As if even this had not been deemed sufficient to provoke an insurrection, it was followed by an assessment of a fourth part of the revenues of the nobles. The Livonians remonstrated, but their representations were condemned by the government of Sweden as treasonable. Their chief then suggested to the king of Poland the project of possessing himself of the country. The king of Denmark was easily induced to join in a plan of hostility against the neighbouring and rival government; and the czar of Russia was impatient to gain possession of the provinces adjacent to the Baltic[24], which were then subject to the Swedes. A coalition was accordingly formed by the three sovereigns to attack the king of Sweden, whose youth and inexperience promised the most successful issue.

The Russian sovereign who engaged in this confederacy, was the celebrated Peter; and the war, thus begun in the concluding year of the seventeenth century, was the school, in which he was trained to arms, and his introduction into the political combinations of Europe. It has been already remarked that the commonly received opinion, which repre-

[22] Puffendorf, tome iii. pp. 69, &c. [23] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 159, &c. [24] Of these Ingria, the most important to Russia, had been conquered from Russia by Gustavus Adolphus in the year 1615.

sents this prince as the original civiliser of his country, is an exaggerated conception, suggested by the surprise, with which Europe beheld him bursting from his remote seclusion, and interesting himself about the arts and institutions of improved societies. Ivan, who reigned in the middle of the sixteenth century, had laid the foundation of the improvement of Russia in the establishment of the sovereign authority upon the ruin of a contentious aristocracy; and Alexis the father of Peter, who died sixteen years after the treaty of Oliva, had begun the superstructure, which Peter was so anxious to complete. Alexis was the first legislator of Russia[25]; in his reign the first Russian ship was constructed; the tactics of western Europe were introduced by him, under the superintendence of officers invited from Germany; various manufactures were established by him in different provinces of the empire; and many treatises concerning the arts and sciences were by his command translated into the language of Russia for the instruction of his people.

Alexis was not immediately succeeded by the son, who has become so illustrious, the six years following his death being occupied by the reign of his eldest son Fedor; nor even at the decease of this prince did Peter at once succeed to the full possession of the sovereign authority, a second son of Alexis, named Ivan, having during seven years divided the government with him. The reign of Peter must therefore be considered, as having properly commenced thirteen years after the death of Alexis, or in the year following the British revolution.

Both the brothers of Peter were princes of feeble constitutions; but Fedor, who reigned alone, was endowed with eminent talents, and prosecuted with success the reduction of the aristocracy, by abolishing their pretensions to hereditary precedency in all employments civil and military[26], which had proved highly detrimental to the public service. The colleague of Peter was a prince of a very different character. Weak in mind[27], almost as much as in body, he was but an instrument in the hands of others, and the period, during which he shared the sovereign dignity, was in effect a noviciate[28], which served to form the habits, and to pre-

[25] Levesque, tome iv. pp. 45, 106. [26] Ibid., p. 115.
[27] Ibid., p. 205. [28] Ibid., pp. 214, 215.

pare the future enterprises, of his younger, but more capable brother.

Peter, too young to be ambitious of command, and too much excluded from business, to excite apprehension by attending to it, was abandoned to his own direction. The favourites whom he chose for himself, were men of low birth and irregular habits; but, being mostly foreigners, they furnished him with his first ideas of the arts, the policy, and the military discipline of improved nations. The conduct, which they taught him, reprehensible as it was, served to detach him from the privileged orders of his country, and disposed him to combine a disregard of external appearances with an absolute exercise of power; the instructions, which they gave him, served to place before his opening mind a world dissimilar to that, in which he lived, and superior to any conception, which he could otherwise have formed. Both together developed the latent character of the man, who could allow himself to be promoted gradually from the lowest station in his own army, while he was exalting the character and importance of his nation; who could work in the dock at Sardam, and triumph over the forces of Sweden.

Nor was the government of Russia neglected during this preparatory period of the life of Peter, for his sister Sophia[29], who really wielded the authority of the feeble Ivan, was a princess of superior ability. She administered the public affairs with vigour and success, and cultivated literature, though almost unknown in her country; and the eulogy of the minister, whom she selected, is concluded by Levesque with observing, that he had conceived the project of reform, which Peter executed.

Peter assumed the undivided exercise of the sovereign power in the year 1689, being then seventeen years old. The important war with Sweden was begun eleven years afterwards, in the year 1700. The interval was filled, partly with the interior arrangements of the government, partly with a war against Turkey, by which the czar obtained possession of Azof and the command of the Black Sea, and partly with those celebrated travels, which presented Peter in so peculiar and interesting a view to the civilized nations

[29] Levesque, tome iv. pp. 231—233.

of Europe. Other sovereigns of Russia had before him invited into their country foreigners[30], who might introduce into it the military discipline, the arts, and the sciences of other nations. It was reserved for this prince to descend from his throne, and to go in quest of the improvement, which he might communicate to his people. It may be doubted, whether even Peter, with all his talents and all his energy, could acquire much information by his hurried inspection of the arts and institutions of Europe; but this unparalleled expedition of discovery served at least to break down the obstinate prejudices and voluntary ignorance of his subjects. How necessary it was for this purpose, may appear from the following anecdotes. When he first announced his intention[31], the clergy condemned it as contrary to those passages of the sacred scriptures, which separated the chosen people from all communication with the surrounding Gentiles; and one of the young men of family, whom he had sent to inspect the arts of Italy, shut himself up there in his chamber, and boasted after his return, that he had neither seen nor learned anything.

Such was the prince, to whom was opposed Charles XII. of Sweden, a hero rather than a sovereign[32]. The Swedish monarch was however the antagonist, whom Peter required, one who could practically train his subjects to the habits of regular warfare, and prepare them for assuming an important position among the nations of Europe; and the Russian monarch accordingly, in his journal[33], consoled himself under his early defeats with the consideration of the instruction, which his people had thus acquired. If Charles had, with the daring valour of a hero, possessed also the wisdom of a sovereign, he would have consulted the interest of his country by more regulated measures, which might have frustrated the plans of the czar, by cutting off the improvement of his troops. Headlong in all his enterprises, and opposing

[30] Levesque, tome iv. p. 253. [31] Ibid. [32] Frederic king of Prussia has recorded of Charles XII., that he always from his youth carried about the Life of Alexander the Great, and regulated his own conduct by it, so that many, who intimately knew him, affirmed that Quintus Curtius ravaged Poland and Saxony, that Stanislaus owed his crown to the promotion of Abdolonymus, and that the battle of Arbela had occasioned the defeat at Pultawa.—Anti-Machiavel, p. 86. Lond., 1741. [33] Levesque, tome iv. p. 295.

only inflexible intrepidity to sagacious perseverance, he at once disciplined Russia and exhausted Sweden.

If so consummate a warrior as Charles XII. [34], had at first directed his efforts against the imperfect institutions of Russia, he must have made a dangerous, if not a fatal impression. The war of Poland however kept this hero of the north at a distance during seven years; and, when at length he seemed to be determined to march his army to Moscow[35], that he might dethrone the czar, as he had already dethroned the king of Poland, he was induced by a fallacious hope of assistance to turn towards the country of the Cossacks, abandoning to defeat a strong reinforcement, by which he was followed. The defeat of this reinforcement was to the Russians the first victory over regular troops, and Peter has described it as the mother of their subsequent success in the memorable battle of Pultawa[36], so delighting in the allusion that he computed the nine intervening months as the period of gestation,

While the czar was causing his Swedish prisoners to manœuvre for the instruction of their conquerors[37], Charles from the defeat of Pultawa sought an asylum at Bender, from which he roused the Turks to war against Russia, and enjoyed the satisfaction of depriving his adversary of his communications with the Black Sea. At length, after five years of intrigue and disappointment, he determined to return to his own territories. These, during his long absence, had been abandoned to the enterprises of his enemies, who took possession of the provinces[38], which were most convenient to them. But, though he returned in disguise, and almost unaccompanied, he was still able to maintain an appearance of resistance, until the dissension of his enemies afforded him an opportunity of making overtures of peace to the Russians[39], that he might avenge himself of the rest. Be-

[34] Levesque, tome iv. p. 326. [35] Ibid., p. 357. [36] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. p. 175. [37] Levesque, tome iv. pp. 382, 413. [38] The king of Denmark possessed himself of Bremen and Verden; the czar became master of all Livonia and Carelia; and Augustus II. recovered the kingdom of Poland.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 177, 178. [39] This dissension first appeared in an expedition undertaken by the czar, the British, and the Dutch, in conjunction with the Danes, to conquer Scania for Denmark; and it was thought that the czar became averse from the enterprise, having discovered, the impolicy of

fore the negotiation with Russia was brought to a conclusion he perished in an invasion of Norway, and his projects of vengeance were frustrated. The treaty of Nystadt however was completed in the year 1721, two years after his death, by which those provinces adjacent to the Baltic were abandoned to Russia[40], for which the czar had originally engaged in the confederacy against Sweden. In writing to his admiral[41], after the victory of Pultawa, the czar told him that he had then solidly laid the foundation of Petersburgh. The treaty of Nystadt justified the observation.

In the year preceding the commencement of the war Peter had done much for the improvement of his subjects. Having been recalled from his travels by an insurrection of the strelitzes, who were the janizaries of the Russian government, he availed himself of the favourable opportunity for crushing this dangerous and inefficient body[42]. Delivered from an embarrassing militia, he proceeded without control in the execution of his plan for assimilating his subjects to the civilised nations of Europe. With this design he introduced the honorary distinction of the order of saint Andrew, to excite the emulation of his people; he abolished the Asiatic garb, which would have maintained a separation between them and the nations proposed to their imitation; and he introduced the women into the general intercourses of society, though in the actual barbarism of his country this was to civilise by corrupting. Nor did the prosecution of the war divert the attention of the czar from this his primary object, for in its third year he caused to be invited from Germany every description of persons[43], which could be useful to his subjects.

rendering the Danes masters of both sides of the Sound. The maritime powers had joined the Danes, because the king of Sweden had permitted his cruisers to capture, without distinction, all vessels which should bring provisions to his enemies. The czar had also caused an apprehension of his preponderance, by sending troops into Mecklenburgh, to support the duke against the nobility.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traites, tome iii. pp. 187, 188. [40] Livonia, Esthonia, Ingria, and a part of Carelia, the fief of Wyburgh, with the isles Oesel, Dagoe, Moen, and the others, from the frontier of Courland, on the coasts of Livonia, Ingria, and the eastern side of Revel.—Ibid., p. 205. [41] Levesque, tome iv. p. 382.

[42] Their spirit however revived in the four regiments of guards, which suppplied their place; and these accordingly, forming a body of nearly ten thousand men, have been the agents, or instruments, of all succeeding revolutions. [43] Levesque, tome iv. p. 300.

In a nation uncivilised, heterogeneous, and dispersed, the first principle of improvement was to increase the energy of the government. Peter accordingly, three years after he had reduced the strelitzes, embraced an opportunity for abolishing the patriarchate, and thus destroying the independence of the clergy. After the decease of the patriarch he delayed to appoint a successor[44], and, when the people by an interruption of twenty years had become habituated to a suspension of the office[45], he intrusted the superintendence of the church to a committee, composed of persons removable at his pleasure. The institution of the patriarchate had rendered the church of Russia independent of that of Greece, and the suppression of it, effected in the year 1721, established the supremacy of the czar.

The attention of Peter seems to have possessed a sort of ubiquity, which marks the superiority of his mind. While he contended with the forces of Charles XII., he prepared for his future triumphs on the Baltic; while he sought amusement in ridiculing the ancient manners of his subjects, he established schools for educating them in the sciences. With all this he was himself a savage to that degree, that he was the executioner of his own vengeance on the rebellious strelitzes. Peter appears to have taken for his model that Ivan[46], who in the sixteenth century had begun the improvement of Russia. Perhaps the imitation was suggested by a just observation of the habits of his people. Savage in his manners, yet enlightened in his mind, perhaps only an individual so singular could connect his country with the civilization of Europe. His coarseness and violence united him with his subjects, his genius with the civilised world.

The correspondence of the issues of life and death to the arrangement of the concerns of nations is perhaps in no instance more conspicuous, than in the case of Peter and his antagonist. Peter, the improver of a mighty empire, survived five years the conclusion of the treaty, which consti-

[44] Levesque, tome iv. p. 300. [45] Ibid., tome v. pp. 94—97.

[46] At once monarch, judge, and executioner, he bathed his hands, like Ivan, in the blood of his subjects.—Levesque, tome iv. p. 273. Like Ivan also he caused one of his nobles, on occasions of ceremony, to represent the majesty of the sovereign, while he himself mingled with officers of that rank, which he had attained in the army.—Ibid., p. 443.

tuted the epoch of its greatness. Charles, who was but the instrument for communicating to it the habits of military discipline, perished two years and a half before the completion of the negotiation. If the life of Charles had been protracted, he would probably have engaged, in conjunction with the czar, in a new series of operations[47], planned with other views, and embarrassing, instead of assisting, the adjustment of the several interests of Europe. He died, after all his dangers, by a dubious hand[48], at the siege of Frederickshald in Norway, and his death permitted Europe to repose from the agitations, which that adjustment had required.

In the Austrian period of the federal policy of Europe the northern and southern powers engaged in one general struggle, and in the various treaties of Westphalia, its supplementary arrangements, and of Oliva, their interests received a general adjustment. At the close of the seventeenth century however, the political relations of the European governments having attained to some degree of maturity, the general system is observed to resolve itself into two distinct combinations, the interests of which, though not wholly disjoined. were much separated, and managed by separate plans of operation. In the same year, in which occurred the death of

[47] Charles was incensed against George I. of Great Britain, because, as elector of Hanover, he had received from Denmark for a sum of money the duchies of Bremen and Verden; and the czar was offended with the powers confederated against Sweden, because these, aware that he was anxious to establish himself in Germany, had declined to employ in the sieges of Stralsund and Wismar, the troops which he had then in Mecklenburg, his resentment being especially directed against Augustus II. of Poland, whom he had raised to the throne of that country, and the king of Great Britain, who had acquired possession of the two duchies. It was accordingly projected by the ministers of Charles and the czar, that these sovereigns should unite their forces to dethrone the kings of Poland and Great Britain, to recover for Sweden the two duchies, and to re-establish the nephew of Charles in the duchy of Holstein, of which he had been deprived; the czar was to obtain from Sweden the cession of Livonia, Ingria, Carelia, and perhaps a part of Finland. The Swedish ministers however precipitated their measures before a peace was concluded with the czar. The baron de Gortz was in consequence arrested in Holland, and the count de Ghillemburgh in London, and the whole plan was frustrated. These agents were arrested in the year 1716, and Charles XII. died in the year 1718. —Regence du duc d'Orleans par Marmontel, tome i. pp. 325, &c. Paris, 1805.

[48] Tooke, in his Life of Catherine II., says that it is now ascertained, that Charles was assassinated.

the king of Spain, so important to the relations of the southern states, as it gave occasion to the great war of the Spanish succession, the kings of Poland and Denmark leagued with the czar of Russia against the young king of Sweden, for the purpose of possessing themselves of various portions of territory, which lay conveniently to their respective dominions. The result of this northern combination was a furious war, which raged in the north of Europe, while the grand alliance was agitating the southern states. The two systems of the south and of the north thus underwent at the same time their separate processes of hostility, the grand operation for adjusting the relative interest of governments; and, while France and the British government were employed in arranging the equilibrium of the southern and principal system, Russia was assuming a position in the lesser system of the north, which might enable that empire, in a yet distant period, to take an important concern in the general interests of the whole of Europe.

In these new arrangements of Europe three great changes were effected, for which the system created by the negotiations of Westphalia had made no provision. Russia, which had been scarcely known among the Christian states of southern Europe, became a powerful and important empire; Prussia from an obscure electorate was transformed into a considerable kingdom, which balanced the power of Austria in the German government; and a great extension of commerce, supplying to maritime nations new resources of power, affected all the combinations by which an equilibrium of power was maintained, and especially aggrandised the British empire. These considerations do not however prove, as Hauterive has contended, that the orderly policy of Europe had ceased to exist, but only that the arrangements formed by the treaty of Westphalia had gradually yielded to others, more accommodated to its progressive improvement. The governments of Europe had assumed more regular forms, their resources had been by commerce greatly multiplied, and their mutual relations had become more extended and more complicated. New combinations were accordingly effected, and these were for the two aggregates of its governments respectively adjusted by the treaties of Utrecht and of Nystadt.

It is true that causes, tending to disturb the new order,

began to operate from the very time of its adjustment. A system of political combinations is not formed of unchangeable masses, like those which compose the planetary system. It is a living organisation, animated throughout all its composition, and therefore subject to the never-ceasing changes, which are the condition and the law of animated existence. What is there in individual man, which is not subject to this great law of change? What then can arrest the changes of a combination of beings thus mutable? What is that policy, which can fix the destiny of a combination of such combinations? When the individual attains to maturity, the principles of destruction are busy in preparing his dissolution. When the general system of Europe was settled in the early part of the eighteenth century, causes had already begun to operate, which towards its conclusion overthrew the entire fabric, and left only the scattered materials of future combinations.

CHAPTER V.

Of the history of the southern system of Europe, from the treaty of Utrecht concluded in the year 1713 *to the end of the seven-years' war in the year* 1763.

The barrier-treaty in the year 1715—Lorraine acquired by France; the two Sicilies ceded to Don Carlos of Spain, 1738—War of the Austrian succession begun, 1740—The peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748—Alliance of France and Austria, seven-years' war begun, 1756—Family-compact of France and Spain, 1761—Seven-years' war ended, 1763.

In the period remaining to be considered, the governments of Europe were distributed into two distinct systems, the southern, comprehending the greater part of its states, and connected by the combinations of a federative policy, and the northern, consisting of the four northern governments, and having for its object the aggrandisement of Russia, not a balance of power. These two systems, though not wholly disjoined, appear to have had separate interests, constituting

separate relations, until towards the conclusion of the great struggle of the French revolution, that greatness, which had been prepared for the principal government of the imperfect system of the north, was brought to bear upon the ruined system of the south, that it might assist in restoring the general independence. These two systems must now be separately examined.

The southern system, as constituted by the treaty of Utrecht, required to be matured by subsequent events, and can only be considered as completed at the expiration of twenty-five years, when the various pretensions of Spain, France, and the empire, were at length adjusted, as the arrangements of the treaty of Westphalia had been perfected by the succeeding treaties of the Pyrenees, of Lisbon, and of the Hague. At the year 1756, or eighteen years from this commencement of its maturity, must on the other hand be fixed the commencement of its decay, for from the time of the connexion of France and Austria a growing disorder spread itself through the system, more and more disturbing its operations. The federative relations of the several governments were from that time gradually more and more confounded, until at length the principle of uniting against the prevailing power of France was wholly abandoned in a commercial jealousy of the British government, which should have been supported in all its resources as the antagonist of that state. In the present chapter the growth and the maturity of the system will be represented, with the earlier part of the period of its decay.

Though by the treaty of Utrecht and the barrier-treaty, the latter of which was concluded two years after the former, the two principal powers, France and Great Britain, had taken their respective stations, and the German empire, confining its peculiar function to the maintenance of the barrier of the Dutch republic, had abandoned, not only the high pretension, with which in the preceding century it had alarmed Europe, but even the secondary character of the rival member of the system, much however still remained to be done, for completing the arrangements of the new combination of political interests. While the Austrian family had been weakened by the transfer of Spain to the rival family of Bourbon, the power of the German branch

of that family had been considerably augmented. The Netherlands, though under mortifying stipulations, had been ceded to the emperor; and, the island of Sicily being left as it were in deposit with the petty sovereign of Sardinia, the kingdom of Naples had been added to the possessions of Austria. Some further adjustments were rendered necessary by the additions thus made to the power of Austria, and twenty-three years elapsed from the conclusion of the barrier-treaty, before they could be effected.

The cession of the Netherlands was necessary, not only for the security of the Dutch provinces against the encroachments of France, but also for the removal of an irksome vicinage of the Spanish power[1], which would have continued to maintain an alienation of France from Spain, though both should be governed by princes of the same family. But this cession appears to have rendered a reciprocal cession on the part of the emperor necessary to the security of France. If, when the emperor had acquired the possession of the Spanish Netherlands, he had continued to hold the duchy of Lorraine, he would, while his own country was protected by this acquisition, have enjoyed an easy opportunity of making a deep impression on the territory of that kingdom. The cession of Lorraine may therefore be considered as a supplemental condition of the arrangement, by which the emperor had become master of the Netherlands previously connected with the crown of Spain.

The actual circumstances of Italy also were inconsistent with the equilibrium of political interests. In the struggle for the Spanish succession the crown of Spain had been stripped of the influence, which it had previously possessed in that country, and Austria, in addition to the pretensions, which it maintained in the northern part of the peninsula, had acquired the actual dominion of its southern region. This state of affairs gave to the latter power a predominance in Italy, which required to be so reduced and controlled, as to establish a balance in that still interesting peninsula. For effecting this arrangement, it was necessary that Spain should recover for one of the princes of the reigning family the kingdom of the two Sicilies; and, to maintain a due

[1] Politique de tous les Cabinets de l'Europe, tome iii. p. 357, par Segur. Paris, 1801.

opposition between the two powers, it was at the same time required, that the influence of Austria should be augmented in the north of Italy, which was accordingly effected by the cession of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, in addition to those of Milan and Mantua.

It has been observed by Koch[2] that, though the peace of Utrecht had been the work of almost all Europe, it did not effect any agreement between the emperor and the king of Spain, who were principally concerned, and that it was even then foreseen, that a long series of negotiations would be necessary for terminating the differences, which had arisen out of the Spanish succession. The adjustments accordingly, which have been mentioned, could not be accomplished without considerable difficulty. This was augmented by the peculiar circumstances of those provinces of the Netherlands, which had been ceded to the emperor. That sovereign, having become possessed of provinces once eminent for commerce, and not having any other eligible communication with the sea, could not readily submit to relinquish the advantages naturally belonging to their situation. Forgetting therefore that their actual condition was the very bond, which, in the altered circumstances of Europe, secured to him from the maritime powers a protection become necessary to his safety, he laboured to establish a company for trading to the East Indies, and thus entered into a direct competition with the very governments, to which he looked for the guaranty of his independence.

The whole period of twenty-three years, which followed the barrier-treaty, was accordingly occupied by a chaos of negotiations, in which the subordinate parts of the system seem to have been discovering their mutual relations and affinities. But this period is also not less characterised by the long continuance of amicable correspondence between the two principal monarchies, France and Great Britain, which was indeed so intimate and confidential, that these two powers, recently engaged in the most determined hostility, were on four occasions united in enforcing the acquiescence of the other governments[3]. These two most con-

[2] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 3. [3] By the triple alliance of France, Great Britain, and the Dutch, in the year 1717; by the quadruple alliance of Great Britain, the emperor,

siderable powers appear thus to have suspended their rivalry, until the system had become settled upon its new principles. The losses too, which both had sustained in the wars of Louis XIV., were in the same interval repaired under the beneficent administration of pacific statesmen; and preparation was made for the renewed opposition of their interests, which should naturally arise from the completion of the general adjustment.

Among the causes of this amicable correspondence of the French and British governments must be mentioned, in the first place, the pacific character of the British minister, Sir Robert Walpole, who was appointed chancellor of the exchequer about a month after the death of Louis XIV., and, except about three years, continued through this whole period to direct the latter of the two governments. This minister, cautious and temporising in the whole tenor of his conduct, was strongly disposed to shun the embarrassment of foreign hostility, regarding it as a guiding principle even in his domestic administration, never to disturb those things which were at rest. Under such a minister it was certain, that no intemperance would provoke hostility, and that every expedient, which prudence could suggest, would be embraced, for averting the mischievous consequences of any occasional misunderstanding.

The circumstances of the British government were such, as suited well the pacific character of the British minister. Great Britain being exposed to the pretension of the exiled family of its princes, which was protected by France, it became the policy even of the minister of the Whigs to maintain a friendly communication with the power, which thus possessed an instrument so well fitted for disturbing the yet unsettled tranquillity of his country. That country at the same time was just then entering upon a period of extended commerce, the advantages of which could not be attained, but under the auspices of peace. The growing

France, and afterwards the Dutch, in the year 1718; by the treaty of Hanover, concluded in the year 1725, between France, Great Britain, and Prussia, to which the Dutch, the Swedes, and the Danes afterwards acceded; and by the treaty of Seville, concluded in the year 1729, between France, Spain, and Great Britain.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. pp. 4, 6, 22, 27.

resources of commerce were to be cherished and improved, and peace was to be preserved by every method not inconsistent with the honour of the nation.

It is, however, remarkable, that the circumstances of the British government were also such, that it was by no means so detached from the concerns of the continent, as to relinquish its important function in the system of Europe. While a Whig minister of a pacific character moderated at home the vehemence of his party, the German connexions of the sovereign involved him in the political combinations of the continental courts. Hanover accordingly became, what the Hague had been, the centre of political discussion; and, though the tranquillity of the British government was preserved with scarcely any interruption, its influence was actively exercised in adjusting the diplomacy of Europe.

The circumstances of the French government were not less favourable than those of the British, to the preservation of tranquillity between these two principal states, and there was even a remarkable similarity between them and those of the British government. France had its pretender, equally as Great Britain. The two governments were accordingly influenced by like apprehensions of the rival claimants of their thrones, and their amity was cemented by the common interest of a reciprocal guaranty of the actual possessors. At the death of Louis XIV. the crown devolved to his great-grandson Louis XV., the sole survivor of the French line of his descendants, then only five years old, and of a very feeble constitution. By the will of the deceased monarch the regency had been committed to a council, of which his nephew, the duke of Orleans, was nominated the president. This prince contrived immediately to set aside the appointment of the board, by which he was to be controlled, and to assume the entire regency; but his claim to this temporary authority was contested by the king of Spain, uncle to the young king. Nor was the competition confined to the regency, which was its immediate object, for the infirm health of the king presented a hope of succession, which the king of Spain wished to realise for one of his sons, to the prejudice of the family of Orleans. Thus circumstanced in regard to the court of

Spain, the regent soon found it expedient to seek in a connexion with the British government a support against its project. He had in the beginning of his regency favoured an expedition of the pretender to the British crown; but this measure assisted his subsequent policy, by disposing the government of Great Britain to maintain such a friendly connexion with France, as might hinder a repetition.

The amicable correspondence of the two courts, which was thus begun by the policy of the regent, was continued by the pacific disposition of the duke of Bourbon, who succeeded him in the government[4], and of cardinal Fleury, who three years afterwards was constituted minister, and held the administration until the year 1748. The alienation of the court of Spain, which might else have expired with the regent, was revived by a measure of his successor the duke of Bourbon. The infanta of Spain had been sent to be educated in France, as the future consort of the king; but, as this princess was not then quite seven years old, and the health of the king was precarious, the minister became apprehensive of the danger of delay, and perhaps jealous of the chance of succession, which it offered to the family of Orleans. The princess was accordingly sent back to Spain, and a consort of a more advanced age was sought for the king[5]. France therefore continued to be urged by the same policy to cultivate a friendly connexion with Great Britain.

The court of Spain was at the same time instigated to an extraordinary inquietude of policy. Alberoni, an Italian, had raised himself into importance by the favour of his countrywoman[6], the second queen of Philip V., and in the very year following the death of Louis XIV., was placed at the head of the Spanish ministry. The passion of this queen was an anxious desire of procuring for her children

[4] The duke of Orleans died soon after that the king, having attained the age of fourteen years, had assumed the direction of the government. In the short intervening time the duke held the office of prime minister. [5] The daughter of Stanislaus, who had been advanced to the throne of Poland by the influence of Charles XII., of Sweden in the year 1704, but had been abandoned by the Poles after the battle of Pultawa, fought in the year 1709. She was married to Louis XV. in the year 1723. [6] The niece and step-daughter of the duke of Parma.—Moore's Life of Alberoni, p. 22. Lond., 1806.

establishments in her own country, where she had a right of inheritance of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, in the event of the expected extinction of the male line of their princes. This wish of the queen coincided with the restless spirit of the minister, and both concurred with the discontent, which rankled in the minds of the Spaniards since the sacrifices made in the treaty of Utrecht.

Though the genius of Alberoni was not of the first order, it was by no means contemptible. He possessed at least the activity, which seems to have been the qualification at this time most necessary for a minister of Spain; and, busily as he was engaged in a great variety of projects of foreign aggrandisement, he was not less busily employed at home in renovating the exhausted resources of the government. For procuring an ally he was forced to look even to the other extremity of Europe. Gortz, the minister of Charles XII. of Sweden, was induced to promise to co-operate with him in supporting an invasion of the pretender to the British crown. Fortunately for the repose of Europe, the power of Gortz was annihilated by the ball, which destroyed his master at the siege of Frederickshald, and Alberoni was left to prosecute his enterprises alone. In his brief, though busy administration, this minister had not time for accomplishing his projects; but in about four years of power he had found sufficient opportunity for exercising two important influences on the policy of Europe.

One of these influences consisted in giving a beginning to the friendly correspondence of the rival governments of France and Great Britain[7]. Busily intriguing in France to support the pretension of his master, he alarmed the fears of the regent, and drove him to seek an alliance with the British government, which he in the like manner disposed to the connexion, by supporting through his intrigues the interest of the pretender. This indeed was not an object, at which he aimed; but the effect was as necessary a result of his measures, as if he had contemplated no other, than to unite the two courts in the most amicable intercourse.

The other consisted in promoting those arrangements, which have been represented as still required for the adjustment of the system. Enterprises undertaken by this minister

[7] Moore's Life of Alberoni, pp. 135, 136.

against Sicily and Sardinia, were immediately successful in regard to their proposed objects, both islands having been speedily reduced, and eventually procured, by the arrangements of the quadruple alliance[8], concluded in the year 1718, the reversion of the duchies of Parma and Placentia and of the grand-duchy of Tuscany for Don Carlos a prince of Spain. The rights thus acquired were, twenty years afterwards, the equivalent, for which the same prince received, by the treaty of Vienna, the kingdom of the two Sicilies. The French government had become involved in a war with the emperor[9], in support of the pretension of the father-in-law of Louis XV. to the crown of Poland; the birth of a dauphin, by putting an end to the expectation, entertained by the king of Spain, of succeeding to the crown of France, had already terminated the alienation of the governments of those countries; and Austria, abandoned by the pusillanimous, though useful policy, of Walpole the British minister, was in the year 1738 compelled to cede the kingdom of the two Sicilies for the reversion of the Italian duchies, and at the same time to yield the duchy of Lorraine to France.

The arrangements, which had been begun by the treaty of Utrecht, were thus perfected after an interval of twenty-five years, which had allowed the system time and tranquillity sufficient for recovering from the shocks of the preceding struggle. Here then began the maturity of the southern and principal combination of European governments, which continued during eighteen years, or until the celebrated alliance of France and Austria, concluded in the year 1756. But though, during these eighteen years, the system continued to maintain the vigour of its functions, causes were already operating, and indeed had begun to operate even before it had been regularly commenced, which, at the expiration of this short period, began to introduce disorder into its arrangements, and at length destroyed all its consistency.

[8] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. pp. 6—11. The duchies were to be held of the empire as male fiefs. Don Carlos was the eldest son of the second marriage of the king of Spain. [9] The dismissal of Alberoni was a result of the quadruple alliance.—Ibid. The war was begun thirteen years afterwards, or in the year 1733. Stanislaus was restored to the throne of Poland by the French, but was in the same year driven from it by the Russians. By the treaty of Vienna, concluded in the year 1738, the duchy of Lorraine was given to him, and after him to the crown of France.

In the last year of the seventeenth century the duchy of Prussia had been constituted a kingdom, and in the same year, in which the treaty of Utrecht was concluded, the first king of Prussia was succeeded by Frederic William, who collected and formed the military force, by which the new kingdom was rendered considerable. The royal title has been described by the grandson of the first king of Prussia[10], the celebrated Frederic, as the scion of ambition, which his grandsire had planted in the bosoms of his posterity; and abundantly did it germinate in the heart of this very sovereign. The three monarchs thus appear to have borne their several parts in the aggrandisement of the new kingdom. The first, vain and ostentatious, procured for his dominions the titular distinction, which excited the ambition of his family; the second, whom George II. of these countries used to denominate his brother the corporal[11], collected the means necessary for indulging this propensity; the third, who was the hero, felt the full influence of the principle inspired by the first, and availed himself to the uttermost of the resources provided by the second. Among the numerous instances of the operation of little causes on the great concerns of nations it may be mentioned, that the notion of aspiring to the royal title is said to have been suggested to the first king of Prussia by a dispute about an arm-chair[12]; and Frederic himself has informed us[13], that the design of creating a military power was prompted in the mind of the second by a pleasantry, which had casually occurred between two Englishmen.

The very year following that, in which the arrangements of Utrecht were completed by the treaty of Vienna, was the year of the accession of Frederic II. to the throne of Prussia.

[10] King of Prussia's Hist. of His Own Times, vol. i. p. 45. Dublin, 1791. [11] Ibid. [12] Koch however has ascribed his ambition to the influence of the advancement of his cousin, the prince of Orange, to the throne of Great Britain, and of his neighbour, the elector of Saxony, to that of Poland.—Tableau des Révol., tome ii. p. 208.

[13] Three Englishmen had wagered, that the king of Prussia could not constantly maintain more than fifteen thousand regular troops. Piqued at this doubt of his resources, he so augmented his revenue, and reduced his other expenses, that he was enabled to pay an army of seventy thousand.—Segur's Life of Frederic William II., Introd., p. xlvi. London, 1801.

In the same year died the emperor Charles II., on which event was to be determined the great question of the Austrian succession, which that emperor had vainly endeavoured to decide in favour of his daughter Maria Theresa. The occasion was irresistibly tempting to the ambition of the young sovereign, who has himself alleged[14], among the motives of his conduct, the consciousness of possessing a formidable army, and a well-replenished treasury. An invasion of Silesia was the offensive war[15], which was most favoured by the situation of his scattered territories, as that enterprise would be carried on upon his frontier, and the Oder would always furnish him with a sure communication. On this enterprise he accordingly determined, and his army entered the province two days before his ambassador arrived at Vienna[16], to announce his pretension. This invasion was the apt precursor to the unwarrantable seizure of western Poland; and the two usurpations gave to the Prussian territories all the compactness, which they were capable of receiving.

In the invasion of Silesia the king of Prussia relied upon the rivalry of France and Great Britain, for procuring the assistance of the one, or the other, of these powers. France however was the power[17], to which he principally looked, because it was the ancient antagonist of Austria, and its armies could afford him more effectual assistance than the subsidies of Britain. In these speculations he was not disappointed. Though the French government had joined in guaranteeing the succession of Maria Theresa, cardinal Fleury discovered a subterfuge[18], by which he evaded the engagement. The first successes of the king of Prussia decided the court of France to connect itself with the rising adversary of its ancient, and still remembered rival; and a confederacy was speedily formed[19], the object of which was

[14] Hist. of His Own Times, vol. i. p. 47. [15] Ibid. [16] Ibid., p. 49. [17] Ibid., pp. 41, 55. [18] He pleaded that the guaranty supposed the clause *salvo præjudicio tertii*, or that France, in giving it could not be understood to prejudice a third party, as the elector of Bavaria, whose just pretensions were not then known. The cardinal added, that the states of the empire had not yet given their sanction to the definitive peace signed at Vienna between the emperor and France.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 52. [19] This confederacy was formed by the elector of Bavaria, with the courts of France and Spain. It was afterwards joined successively by the king

to raise the elector of Bavaria to the imperial throne, and to dismember the provinces of the queen of Hungary.

Maria Theresa had at first no other resources than those, which were furnished by her own inflexible resolution. The pacific and temporising efforts of Sir Robert Walpole, the British minister, were anxiously employed in endeavouring to negotiate a compromise between her and the king of Prussia; but the queen indignantly rejected every proposal of sacrificing a portion of Silesia to the rapacity of her enemy, threw herself upon the attachment and valour of her hereditary subjects of Hungary, and declared herself determined to maintain the contest to the last extremity of resistance. Their enthusiastic admiration of her fortitude at length roused the British people to support her, and the timid minister, who had shrunk from the struggle, was driven from his post of power. The movement, which was thus begun by Great Britain, was seconded by the United Provinces. These two powers formed with Austria a combination, opposed to the confederacy of Prussia, France, and Spain; and the struggle was begun, which terminated in securing to Prussia the possession of Silesia, and thus rendering that government a formidable antagonist to Austria.

The war, thus commenced for the Austrian succession, changed its character in the progress of hostilities. The British government and the United Provinces at first only furnished subsidies for the support of the queen of Hungary; and France, though furnishing troops, acted only as an auxiliary. But the other enemies of the house of Austria, except Spain, gradually withdrew from the contest, or were converted into allies; the British government, from a subsidizing ally, became a principal party in support of the interest of the queen of Hungary; and France, feebly assisted by Spain, was exposed to the attacks of a confederacy led by Great Britain, and was reduced to struggle for her own power.

The two rival governments of the system, being at length committed in direct hostility, were diversely successful ac-

of Poland, as elector of Saxony; by the kings of Prussia and Sardinia; and by the electors of Cologne and the Palatinate. To hinder the Russians from assisting the queen, the Swedes were induced to declare war against them.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 52.

cording to the respective characters of a continental and a maritime state. France overcame all the resistance, which the maritime powers could oppose to her in the Netherlands, and also took possession of Savoy and the county of Nice, while Great Britain destroyed the French marine[20], and became possessed of Cape Breton, which commands the Gulf of Saint Lawrence and Canada. The exhaustion of the struggle gave occasion to the accommodation, which was concluded at Aix-la-Chapelle, eight years after the invasion of Silesia. The two principal powers having interchanged the restoration of their conquests, the acquisition of Silesia, which was guaranteed to Prussia, appeared to have been almost the sole result of these hostilities. This was however a most important event in the history of Europe, as it broke the unity of the Germanic government[21] by establishing a rival of Austria in the heart of the empire, and also as the practice of spoliation was then begun, which from that time destroyed the combination of the system.

The war terminated by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, had thus introduced into the southern system of Europe a power capable of sustaining an important part in its arrangements. The seven years' war, which followed at an interval of eight years, indicated the action of this new power, in driving Austria into an alliance with France her ancient adversary.

The empress was so deeply chagrined at the sacrifices, which she had been compelled to make, that her minister was ordered to speak of the peace as a subject of condolence[22]; and, as she well knew that the treaty had left too

[20] Two sea-fights fought in the year 1747 reduced the French navy to a single ship of war.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 74.

[21] Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 341. The king of Prussia has, in a very pointed manner, described the ridicule and contempt, with which the pretensions of his father had been treated by the neighbouring potentates. His government he has characterised, as a kind of hermaphrodite, which was rather more an electorate than a kingdom; and the fame of determining the nature of this being he has mentioned, as one of the many incentives of his own ambition.—Hist. of His own Times, p. 45.

[22] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. pp. 358, &c. She was obliged to restore her conquests in Italy, to confirm the cession of Silesia and Glatz to the king of Prussia, and to yield to Don Philip the duchess of Parma, Placentia, and Guastalla. She likewise ratified the cessions made by the treaty of Worms to the king of Sardinia, of Vigevenasco, part of the Parmesan, and the county of Anghiera.

many pretensions undecided, to be more than a suspension of hostilities, she without loss of time availed herself of the opportunity of preparing for a renewal of the war, by amending the regulation of her finances, and adopting every expedient of improved discipline, which might render her army more effective. The king of Prussia was not less assiduous in his preparation for the contest[23]. He reclaimed extensive wastes by draining marshy land, he encouraged the settlement of foreigners in his territories, he established new manufactures while he favoured the old, and he caused an entire change of the administration of justice, by forming a new system of laws[24], from him denominated the Frederician code. At the close of eight years, thus employed by the two governments, began the struggle, which, by the change effected in the political relations of Austria, became the epoch of the decay of the principal system of Europe.

There had been indeed in the Austrian government a predisposition to this change, which had grown out of the very constitution of the system. The barrier-treaty gave to Austria the Netherlands, which had belonged to Spain; but it gave these provinces as a barrier for the Dutch against the encroachments of France, not as a territory to be possessed in full dominion. The ceded provinces were accordingly to be garrisoned by the troops of the Dutch republic, and their commercial advantage was by express stipulations sacrificed to the interests of the maritime powers, by which they had been wrested from Spain. It was however not unnatural that Austria should be disposed to regard them in the same view with other territories, and become impatient of restrictions, which forbade the improvement of their natural resources. The discontent of the government was indeed suspended during the war[25], in which all the resources of the maritime powers were engaged in its support. It was however renewed with augmented force by the earnestness, with which the empress had been urged to make the sacrifices necessary for the peace, and by the precipitation, with which the preliminaries were settled.

[23] His Hist. of the Seven Years' War, ch. i. [24] The Frederician code derives its general principles from the Roman law. The king however forbade all comments, nor would he permit the opinions of doctors to be cited in civil causes.—Fred. Code, pref., p. xxviii. Edinb., 1761. [25] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 370.

The barrier-treaty might have still continued to maintain a connexion between Austria and the maritime powers, if the aggrandisement of Prussia had not determined it to seek in the alliance of France, its ancient rival, the means of resisting, perhaps of humiliating, its new competitor for power. France indeed was with difficulty induced to renounce its ancient hostility to Austria[26], and to dissolve the Prussian connexion, which was accommodated to its habitual policy. A change of that policy was however prompted by a convention concluded in the year 1756, between Great Britain and Prussia, for the protection of Hanover, then threatened by the French. A dispute having arisen between Great Britain and France concerning the limits of their respective settlements in America, which the recent treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle had left undetermined, and the latter power having made preparation for invading Hanover, the former demanded of the court of Vienna the fulfilment of the treaties existing between the two governments, and the repayment of the assistance, which in the late war had been liberally afforded. The court of Vienna on the other hand pleading its apprehension of the hostility of Prussia, as a reason for withholding the required succours, the British government resolved to place the electorate under the protection of that power. The convention then concluded overcame the hesitation of France, and the memorable treaty was in the same year concluded, which terminated the rivalry of France and Austria.

It was the natural result of the aggrandisement of Prussia, that Austria should seek to be connected with France. A formidable power, influencing the protestant states of the empire, had been raised in the immediate vicinity of the hereditary dominions, and the Austrian government would have been much embarrassed in opposing a sufficient resistance at once to the king of Prussia for the protection of Bohemia, and to the king of France for the defence of the Netherlands. The alliance of France on the other hand secured the Austrian dominions on that side, and in Italy; the influence maintained by that government in the councils of the Turks protected them from invasion on the side of Hungary; and the whole force of the Austrians might in this

[26] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. pp. 374—376.

case be collected to oppose the efforts of their enemies in the north of Germany.

In France the treaty was regarded with a jealous eye, as inconsistent with the ancient and genuine policy of the government. It even became the subject of that extraordinary phenomenon in the administration of a state, a double cabinet with a double confidence [27], which had been formed about twelve years before this time on occasion of the election of a king of Poland, and was continued ten years afterwards. It was however at that time no longer possible to reason in the same manner, as at the time of the treaty of Westphalia [28], when the British government was almost a stranger to the contentions of the continent, when Russia was destitute of influence, and even unknown, and France, combined with Sweden, presented the only support of the liberties of Germany. The great increase of the commercial interest of Europe, the policy of the newly-formed monarchy of the north of Germany, and the civilisation and improvement of Russia, had all rendered it expedient for France to seek to connect itself with some great power of the continent. If moreover France had adhered to her Prussian alliance, and left Austria to Great Britain, either that state might have been impelled to connect itself with Russia [29], and thus to spread confusion through the system, or the king of Prussia might have become the sovereign of Germany, and have presented to France a rivalry not compatible with the later arrangement, by which Great Britain was constituted the proper rival of that power [30].

Though the combinations of the southern system of Europe thus appear to have been formed in correspondence to the relative interest of the states, of which it was composed, when the British government connected itself with Prussia, and France attached itself to Austria, they must however be regarded as indicating the decay of the system, and por-

[27] This secret correspondence was probably begun in the year 1743 or 1744, and was continued to the death of Louis XV. It had been suggested by Madame Chateauroux, one of the mistresses of that king, who was desirous of hindering any other minister from possessing the exclusive confidence, which had been enjoyed by cardinal Fleury. The prince de Conti was the chief manager.—Politique des tous les Cabinets, tome i. pp. 53, 54. [28] Ibid., pref. pp. 10, 11. [29] Ibid., p. 56, note. [30] Ibid., tome i. p. 253.

tending its approaching dissolution. The favourite language of the new policy was, that it was a combination of the great powers to secure the tranquillity of the continent. From the moment, in which this principle was adopted, the stamina of the system were destroyed; and, though an exterior appearance of health might for some time be preserved, it was but a specious concealment of a mortal malady. When a system is composed of very unequal parts, it must be maintained by supporting the weak against the strong, not by a combination of the strong to enforce the acquiescence of the weak. The fruits of this principle were soon discoverable in the troubles of the Netherlands, and in the partition of Poland.

The history of the seven-years' war bears a remarkable correspondence to that of the struggle, by which it had been immediately preceded. In this war the powerful confederacy, united against the king of Prussia, threatened his dominions with the dismemberment, which in the preceding had menaced the territories of Austria [31]; the heroic fortitude, with which the Prussian monarch received the attacks of his enemies, excited in the British nation even a more ardent enthusiasm, than that before inspired by the magnanimity of Maria Theresa [32]; and the war was concluded, like the former, with leaving that prince in possession of the valuable province, which he had occupied in the beginning of his reign, and Austria had vainly laboured to recover by the assistance of its new alliance.

The seven-years' war had other important influences, besides that it gave occasion to the new relations of Austria and Prussia. It gave occasion also to the family-compact which in the year 1761 united the forces of France and Spain; and, by the treaty concluded in the year 1763, it transferred to Great Britain the colonial possessions of France on the continent of America.

The fear of the maritime ambition of the British government, tended naturally to attach Spain more closely to its rival[33], and to render that connexion more intimate, which had been begun in the year 1701 by the establishment of a French dynasty on the throne of that country. The family-

[31] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 409. [32] Ibid., p. 418.
[33] Politique des tous les Cabinets, tome iii. p. 363.

compact accordingly, in the year 1761, combined in a strict alliance these two states, and gave to France the disposal of a navy at that time not inconsiderable[34]. This treaty, concluded about two years before the termination of the war, had also the effect of directing against the colonial possessions of Spain, during this short interval, those attacks, which had been limited to the dependencies of France. Spain was accordingly rendered a partner in the sacrifices of the peace; and the whole of the vast territory of North America on the eastern side of the Mississippi, together with Nova Scotia and Canada, became subject to the British government in the year 1763[35].

Here we discover a remarkable example of those adaptations of the times of political events, which essentially influence their results. If the family-compact had been concluded in the beginning of the war, before the fleet of France had been overpowered by the naval force of Great Britain, the accession of the Spanish marine might have composed a navy too powerful for the strength of its adversary. Most favourably however to the success of the British government, the extraordinary exertions made by France for the support of her new alliance with Austria, had abandoned her marine and her colonies to the assaults of her maritime rival, and the family-compact was accordingly signed upon the ruin of her naval resources. This critical postponement has been by Segur[36] attributed to the influence, which a queen of Portugal, who was the daughter of an archduchess, and had been educated in a partiality for England, possessed over Ferdinand VI. of Spain, who died in the year 1759. The pretext, according to this writer, of the antecedent alienation of Spain, was dissatisfaction on account of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which had been concluded by France without the concurrence of Spain, and had thus imposed on the latter a necessity of making great sacrifices.

[34] In the year 1756 the marine of Spain, being then in its highest prosperity, was estimated to comprehend from fifty-five to sixty ships of the line.—Politique des tous les Cabinets, tome ii. p. 241. [35] Spain ceded Florida, and all her territory, to the east and south-east of the Mississippi; France ceded Nova Scotia and Canada with its dependencies. Louisiana was ceded by France to Spain in compensation for Florida.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. pp. 118—122.

[36] Politique des tous les Cabinets, tome ii. pp. 205, 239.

The great acquisition of colonial territory very opportunely augmented the resources of Great Britain, just when France had become united with Austria on the one part, and yet more closely on the other with Spain. Not many years indeed had elapsed, when this very acquisition was found to have loosened the ties, which had bound the original colonies to the mother-country; but the separation of those colonies has been subsequently found to increase the resources of the empire, though its territory was diminished, the growing prosperity of the new republic, which was the fruit of its independence, multiplying the consumers of the manufactures of Great Britain.

Another, and a most important influence, may now be traced to the acquisition of Canada, the principal of the colonial cessions made by France. By the treaty concluded in the year 1763 the liberty of professing the religion of Rome[37] was granted to the inhabitants of that colony, so far as was permitted by the laws of England. This was understood to guarantee to them the maintenance of the existing establishment of their church; and the example of the formal establishment of a Roman Catholic church under a protestant sovereign has at length re-acted upon the constitution of the mother-country, where, in the year 1829, Roman Catholics were admitted to both houses of parliament.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the history of the southern system of Europe, from the end of the seven-years' war in the year 1763 *to the end of the insurrection of the Netherlands in the year* 1791.

The first partition of Poland in the year 1772—The war of Bavaria, 1778—The peace of Teschen, 1779—The Dutch barrier dismantled, 1781—The troubles of the Netherlands, 1787—these terminated, 1791.

THE termination of the seven-years' war was the grand climacteric of the federative policy of Europe. In its progress, though the system continued to maintain its equilibrium,

[37] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. pp. 118—122.

and even appeared to have extended and strengthened its federal relations, yet changes had occurred, which essentially altered its principles, and commenced its decay. The newly formed royalty of Prussia was balanced by the newly formed connexion of France and Austria; the family-compact, which bound Spain to France, was in part compensated by the ascendency, which the British government acquired over Portugal; and the acquisitions of our government on the continent of America were poised by the continental peace, which permitted the rival government to direct an undivided attention to maritime concerns, its neglected and enfeebled navy being at the same time recruited by the junction of the marine of Spain. The various parts of the system, as it existed in the year 1763, appeared to have been sufficiently accommodated one to another, though in greater extension and complexity, and the whole even seemed to have acquired a greater degree of stability. This apparent stability was however fallacious, and at this very time the work of deterioration had commenced, just as the human body, while it yet exhibits the appearance of robust and even florid manhood, has inwardly begun the decay, which is to end in decrepitude and dissolution.

The dissolution of the system did actually begin about thirty years from this time; and, though in the comprehensive arrangements of the divine providence a smaller system of policy, while its principles are yet sound and vigorous, may be made to yield to the formation, or extension, of some more considerable combination, yet no primary system of human co-operation has ever been devoted to destruction, except when its principles had been already corrupted, and the violence by which it was dissolved, served only to hasten its decay, and probably to preserve for a new order of things some elements of good, which might otherwise have been destroyed in the progress of corruption. The Jewish worship was not superseded by the more spiritual religion of our Redeemer, until its efficacy had been almost wholly lost among contending sects, and human tradition substituted by the more religious for the commandments of God. Even the idolatry of the pagan worship, better than the total absence of all religious sentiment, was not set aside by the doctrine of Christ, until it had been so weakened in its hold

of the public mind, that Cicero described its ministers as unable to officiate in its augural ceremonies without a smile of derision, and Lucian openly ridiculed the received stories of its gods. When the Grecian republics were subdued by the policy and the arms of Philip of Macedon, their degeneracy must have been deep and decisive, since the brave and virtuous Phocion could pronounce resistance hopeless, and exhort his reluctant countrymen to a prudent submission. In the memorable subversion of the western empire we are tempted to lament the devastations of barbarism, spreading over the invaluable refinements of a long series of cultivated ages; but on a closer examination we discover, that the western empire was then rapidly declining into the worse barbarism of corrupted civilisation, and we learn to regard its rude invaders as the salutary, though severe, regenerators of its vitiated principles. The church of Rome too, before it received from Luther the shock of the reformation, had almost ceased to exercise any influence upon the hearts of men; and that it has since continued to maintain itself in the world, seems to have arisen wholly from the improvement, which was wrought in it by the chastisement of that visitation.

The alliance concluded between France and Austria in the year 1756, at the commencement of the seven-years' war, which gave occasion to these new arrangements, arose naturally out of the preceding relations of the principal governments of Europe; and the progressive operation of causes and effects may be traced even from the treaty of Westphalia, by which a systematic arrangement of federative policy was first adjusted. Austria[1], by the connexion then established between France and the protestant states of Germany, began from that time to descend from the high station of the principal power of the system to that of the secondary, and in process of time even below the rank of the secondary government, which before the close of the

[1] By the treaty France was invested with a right of interfering in the contests, which should arise between the states and the emperor. Ten years afterwards the exercise of this right was rendered systematical by the formation of the league of the Rhine, which gave so much influence to France, in the affairs of the empire, as often surpassed the authority of its chief.—Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 362, 364.

seventeenth century was occupied by Great Britain. This considerable reduction of the importance of Austria could not be effected, without loosening so much the bands of the Germanic confederacy, as to afford opportunity for the formation and aggrandisement of the new monarchy of Prussia. This new monarchy again as naturally disposed the sovereign of the empire, to seek support from his ancient rival against his nearer and more dangerous enemy. When this alliance was concluded, the system in truth lost its principle of combination, for the barrier-treaty, by which Austria had been bound to the maritime powers, ceased to have any influence on the policy of that government. The barrier still existed for the protection of the Dutch provinces; but the power of Austria, which should have assisted in maintaining it, was transferred to the government interested in its destruction. As the general confederacy of European governments had grown out of the interior system of the Germanic confederacy, so did the decay of the former arise from that internal change of the constitution of the empire, by which it had been transformed from a federative republic, of which the emperor was the chief, into a balanced system of two distinct confederacies, the one under the presidency of Austria, the other under that of Prussia.

The new connexion was the subject of a long and violent contention among the parties of the French government; nor would it have been maintained in the reign of Louis XVI., if the influence of the queen had not been exerted for its support. It might indeed have been more suitable to the true policy of France[2] to form alternate connexions with the two rival governments of Germany, as it was certainly her interest to hinder either from attaining an overbearing ascendency. The actual effect however of the Austrian alliance was a continental tranquillity, which permitted France to turn its attention to maritime affairs, and to assist by a powerful armament the revolted colonies of Great Britain. If Austria, not controlled by Prussia, and not connected with France, had preserved its efficiency in the system of Europe, it would have been led to support the interest of Great Britain by a continental diversion, which must have disabled the French government for interfering in the struggle of

[2] Politique de tous les Cabinets, tome iii. pp. 354, 357.

America. The Austrian alliance deprived the British government of this resource. France was accordingly left at liberty to direct all its efforts to the acquisition of a considerable naval power, and the independence of the American colonies was the result.

So far the balanced state of Germany, with the Austrian alliance, was to France an occasion of triumph, as it was to Great Britain an occasion of defeat and humiliation. Few years however elapsed, before the re-action of this very revolution aroused into operation the revolutionary principles of the great monarchy, by which it had been assisted. The principle of the system had been already destroyed by the altered state of Germany; the changed relation of France and Austria gave the decisive impulse to the revolution of North America; and the American revolution, in re-acting upon France, overthrew the chief government of the system, from the previous decay of which it had mainly arisen. In the revolution of France whatever remained of the system of Europe was violently destroyed. The re-action of the colonial revolution indeed might not have generated a revolution in France, if that country had not been, in its own internal condition, strongly predisposed to the subversion of its government. Its operation therefore in this respect seems only to have been to accelerate a revolution, which would otherwise have been effected, though not so soon, and perhaps not with so great violence. The suddenness and violence of the French revolution may have been necessary to its efficacy, in bringing the wasted system to a speedy dissolution.

The Prussian monarchy, which drove the Austrian government into a connexion thus important in its consequences, was in all the principles of its formation the well-adapted instrument of disorganisation. Having grown out of the decay of the German empire, it was foreign from the established relations of the European governments, and was accordingly fluctuating and uncertain in all its policy except its jealousy of Austria; composed of dissimilar and scattered provinces, connected only in subjection to a common sovereign, and to be preserved only by a military power, it naturally became an armed despotism, unfriendly to the security of the neighbouring states: and the geo-

graphical disposition of its territories, separated as they were into two portions by the interposition of a part of Poland, appears to have, as it were, prescribed to it the forcible partition of that country, which gave the fatal blow to a system of federal protection.

Even this remarkable adaptation was improved by the avowed and strenuous irreligion of the sovereign, to whom it was principally indebted for its greatness. It should be remembered that, long before infidelity was avowed by the revolutionary government of France, it had been professed upon the throne of Prussia; and from this portentous appearance of an infidel sovereign may principally have been derived the lax and arbitrary interpretation of the sacred writings[3], which has so unhappily characterised the protestant clergy of Germany. The religious circumstances of Germany had indeed a natural tendency towards this vagueness of interpretation. The three religious communities of that country are so intermixed[4], that the two sects of Pro-

[3] In the edict concerning religion, published by Frederic-William II. at his accession, in the year 1786, we find the following passage. 'Some years before our elevation to the throne we have observed with regret, that several clergy of the protestant communion permit themselves a liberty altogether unbounded with regard to the dogmas of their persuasion; that they deny several fundamental points and truths of the christian religion in general, and in their exhortations adopt a new-fangled style, entirely different from the spirit of true christianity, which might in the end shake the pillars of the faith of Christians. They blush not to renew the miserable errors of Socinians, Deists, and Naturalists, long ago refuted, and to diffuse them among the people with as much boldness as imprudence, under the name of philosophy, by a strange abuse of that name. They blush not to diminish daily the authority of the bible, as the revealed word of God; to falsify that divine source of the salvation of mankind; to give forced explanations of it, or even to reject it entirely; to represent it to men as suspicious and superfluous faith in the mysteries of revealed religion in general, and particularly the mysteries of the redemption and sacrifice of the Saviour of the world, to lead them thus into error, and in this manner everywhere to brave christianity.'—Reign of Frederic-William II. by Segur, vol. i. pp. 442, 443. [4] The three confessions of Germany, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Calvinist, are professed in many small contiguous principalities, and there is scarcely one of these, in which all the three have not free exercise. Innumerable were the projects for moderating the differences between the three churches. One of these was the establishment of a *philanthropine*, or academy of general education, in the principality of Anhault-Dessau, by a man named

testants, the Lutherans and the Calvinists, have been brought into a union for the support of their common cause against the Roman Catholics; and, as the right of free inquiry was the very principle of their separation from the church of Rome, this right was exercised to an excess, in which they were led to explain away religion itself. The want also of a liturgy and precise form of belief, prescribed and maintained by a public authority, had left the Protestants of Germany to be influenced by every vague speculation, which ingenious men might offer to their attention. Attempts were moreover made to amalgamate the three churches into one, which contributed yet more to efface the characteristic doctrines of christianity. But the notorious infidelity of Frederic II., originating probably from his early admiration[5] of the literature of France, gave a fashion of irreverent freedom in religious discussion, much beyond the influence of these predisposing causes. The reign of Frederic appears thus to have been the epoch at once of an audacious disavowal of revealed religion, and of a corrupt interpretation of its principles; to have encouraged the assaults of its enemies, and to have enfeebled the resistance of its champions. Such a reign in such a government was an apt precursor of the disorganisation of Europe. The government had grown out of the decay of the federative combinations of the empire, and tended to disorder what remained of the general system. The reign propagated the corruption of that religious principle, without the influence of which neither systems, nor governments, can be held in connexion.

Even of this evil however, great as it was, we may take the cheering view, that it was not unmixed, but eventually the instrument of good. When the pride of philosophy had prompted men to place an undue reliance on the power of reason, nothing could so effectually recall them to the sober exercise of their understandings, as that it should pursue its course without restraint, and exhibit fully to the

Bassidow, which appears to have chiefly occasioned the lamentable corruption of the protestant religion in the empire.—Robinson's Proofs of a Conspiracy. pp. 80—87. Dublin, 1798. [5] Four years before his accession he addressed to Voltaire a letter composed in the most complimentary language.

world the vanity of its pretensions. The prostitute worshipped in the frenzy of the French revolution sent back multitudes to an humble profession of the gospel of Christ; and the extravagant speculations of the German theologians, terminating in a rejection of every tenet, which could distinguish Christianity from simple deism, have excited a religious re-action, which promises to regenerate the faith of the original country of the Reformation.

The military character of the Prussian government appears to have given birth to the military conscription, which in the mighty struggle of our own time, has brought into the field the whole active population of the French empire. The experience of the seven-years' war having pointed out to the court of Vienna the necessity of imitating the example of its formidable neighbour[6], the same practice was in the year 1772 introduced into the greater part of the Austrian dominions. Nor was the innovating violence of Prussia confined to continental objects, for Frederic II. appears to have first insisted on the pretension, that free ships should make free goods, on which was afterwards formed the maritime system of armed neutrality, opposed to the naval ascendency of Great Britain[7]. This pretension was advanced by him in the years 1747 and 1748; and, though the claim was resisted by our government, he contrived to indemnify his subjects for the losses sustained in the contest, by seizing a part of the Silesian revenues due to the merchants of Great Britain[8]. On the land and on

[6] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 489. [7] A memorial on this subject was presented in the year 1747 by the Prussian ambassador to the states-general of the United Provinces.—Mem. of Frederic III. by Towers, vol. i. p. 286. Dublin, 1789. The principle however, that free ships should make free goods, appears to have been amicably suggested by the Swedes, in a negotiation with Oliver Cromwell in the year 1656, but declined by the English ministry.—Whitelock's Memorials, p. 627. [8] The revenues of Silesia had been mortgaged by the emperor Charles VI. to some British merchants, as a security for a loan, and the empress-queen, in ceding Silesia, had stipulated, that the king of Prussia should stand in the place of the late emperor, with respect to this debt. The king however detained 200,000 crowns, as a reprisal for eighteen Prussian ships captured by the British, and thirty-three neutrals, in which the subjects of Prussia were concerned.

the sea he was equally hostile to the existing order. On the land he set the example of transforming a people into an army; on the sea he proclaimed resistance to the established regulations of maritime war. The prince-royal, his brother, appears to have been deeply sensible of the ruinous policy of this celebrated monarch, for, perceiving that his own death was approaching[9], he is said to have addressed to the king a letter of most earnest remonstrance, in which he told him, that 'men read in his success the slavery of the human race, the annihilation of laws, the degradation of society.' The calamities of the French revolution have abundantly justified this emphatic admonition. From Frederic himself the ruin, which his brother apprehended for him, was averted, not by the wisdom of his counsels, nor by the power of his resources, but by the seasonable death of Elizabeth empress of Russia[10], who had been a most formidable enemy, and was succeeded by sovereigns favourable to his interest.

It may afford matter of profound reflection, that these precedents of disorder were very remarkably turned both against the government, by which they had been established, and also against France, where they were followed to the utmost extent of application. Among the subjugated governments of Europe none drank so deeply as Prussia of the bitter cup of degradation and dependence; and the power of Napoleon was overturned by his peremptory interference with the existing arrangements of commerce, and by the operation of his conscriptions in rendering other nations military[11], while he spared as much as possible the people of France.

The example of successful violence, exhibited by Prussia, was conjointly imitated by France and Spain, then united

[9] Towers's Mem. of Frederic III., vol. ii. pp. 148, &c.

[10] She died early in the year 1762. Her nephew Peter III., by whom she was succeeded, held the king of Prussia in the highest admiration, and immediately offered to sacrifice for peace all the conquests of Russia, engaging to join his troops with those of Frederic even against powers in alliance with his own empire. Peter was deposed, before he could afford to the king any assistance; but his wife and successor, Catherine II., influenced probably by a discovery of remonstrances addressed to him in her favour by Frederic, adhered to the peace, while she recalled the troops.—Ibid.

[11] This observation was made by Sir Walter Scott in his Life of Buonaparte.

by the family-compact. The close connexion of these governments suggested the scheme of attacking the interests of Great Britain through her commercial connexion with Portugal[12], and in defiance of every principle of justice, it was made an express condition of this confederacy, that Portugal should be compelled to renounce her neutrality, and attach herself to the allied courts. Portugal was accordingly attacked by Spain; but, the power of Great Britain being exerted for her protection, the aggression had no other consequence, than, as was pointedly said at the time by the old lord Tyrawley[13], that Spain thereby told her the secret of her own weakness.

This outrage was committed against the law of nations towards the conclusion of the seven-years' war. In the year 1772, nine years after the conclusion of the war, it was proved to the world that this law had ceased to command any respect, and that the system of Europe was rapidly degenerating into a shameless struggle of rapacity. In this instance the scheme was projected by Prussia, and the concurrence of the other powers procured by her management.

The plan of partitioning Poland appears to have been formed by the king of Prussia[14], and to have been by him proposed, first to Austria, and afterwards to Russia. As Russia grasped at the exclusive possession of that country, a concurrence in a plan of partition could not have been obtained at the court of Petersburgh without much address of management, assisted by favourable circumstances. It was accordingly necessary in the first instance to secure the co-operation of the court of Vienna. This was obtained without much difficulty. Russia, being engaged in a war with Turkey, was then induced by an apprehension of the hostility of Austria, to accept a portion of Poland as an indemnification for restoring Walachia and Moldavia, which had been taken from the Turks.

[12] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 109. [13] Politique de tous les Cabinets, tome ii. p. 229. [14] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 500, note. Count Hertzberg, who was consulted on the occasion by the king, having remonstrated against admitting the house of Austria to a share of the spoil, Frederic replied, 'Ils partageront aussi la blame.'

Thus was begun, in the year 1772, the plan of partition, which was followed twenty-one years afterwards by the second division of Poland. In the first preparation of this great outrage, preparation was carefully made for its subsequent consummation. For insuring the continuance of the evils[15], by which Poland had been rendered defenceless, and even aggravating their mischievous operation, a system of regulations was devised for the remaining territory, comprehending all the existing abuses of the government, and adding to the limitations of the royal power other restrictions, which rendered it absolutely nugatory; and under the insulting pretence of providing for the future prosperity of the country, which they had spoiled, this collection of grievances was, after a resistance of two years, forced by the allied powers as an amended constitution on the Polish delegates, who had become sensible of the evil of their once valued privileges.

Where was on this occasion that provident apprehension of remote and contingent danger, which had used to excite a sensitive alarm at every encroachment, and had bound the states of Europe in the most complicated combinations? The answer may be found chiefly in the very magnitude of the exertions, to which a jealousy of the balance of power had recently stimulated those very powers. The seven-years' war had spread over every region of the globe, and had wearied and exhausted the energies of Europe. In the season of lassitude, which followed this extraordinary exertion, it was not difficult to procure the acquiescence of the other governments. A change of ministry in the French government was even critically favourable, by disabling the opposition of the court of Vienna, which at first was adverse to the plan notwithstanding the offered share of the spoil, as it was unwilling to bring the Prussians into a closer

[15] 'The partitioning powers excluded all prospect of reform by perpetuating the elective form of the monarchy, the *liberum veto*, and the other inherent defects of the constitution; and still further circumscribed the authority of the crown by taking from the king the appointment of bishops, castellans, palatines, and ministers of state, and the patronage of the starosties or royal fiefs, and by vesting the executive power in a permanent council chosen by the diet, and presided by the king.'—Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 508.

vicinage[16]. With this feeling a communication of the scheme was made to the French court by that of Vienna, for the purpose of discovering, whether the former would give assistance in opposing it; but a court-intrigue had displaced the duke of Choiseul, who had already encouraged the Turks to resist the ambition of Russia, and had substituted for him the duke d'Aguillon, who confined his attention to the management of domestic cabals. Of the British government the author has been fortunately enabled to assert[17], that it was wholly ignorant of the transaction. It may indeed be questioned, whether the nation, which had been recently connected with Russia by an advantageous treaty of commerce, would have been disposed to forego its benefits for a consideration so remote and general, as the preservation of the integrity of a country in the north of Europe. How powerful was the influence of such an interest, Mr. Pitt experienced, when he reluctantly relinquished his purpose of protecting Turkey against the encroaching spirit of the same state.

The southern countries of Europe did not afford so convenient a subject for a conspiracy of governments, as Poland constituted in its northern region. The new plan of partition therefore was not introduced among them. But the unprincipled violence, of which the spoliation of Prussia had exhibited so striking an example, was eagerly imitated, and this too in a case, in which it directly struck at what yet remained of a system of equilibrium.

Two years after the conclusion of the seven-years' war,

[16] Politique de tous les Cabinets, tome i. pp. 146, 147. [17] The late captain Edward Hamilton communicated to the author the following anecdote relative to this transaction. Sir Robert Murray Keith, who was British minister at Vienna when it was determined, returned to England on leave of absence some months afterwards, and meeting lord Weymouth, the secretary of state for foreign affairs, at White's while they waited for two more to form their party at whist, asked him, whether he had not been very fortunate in procuring for him the copy of the treaty, which he had sent him. The secretary protested that he had never received such a paper, and a search being made, the letter was found in the foreign-office with the seal unbroken. This anecdote, he added, had been told to him by two persons, to whom Sir R. M. Keith had related it, and who said he had often told it, to prove how the characters of ambassadors were at the mercy of indolence and ignorance.

Joseph II. had succeeded his father[18] in the imperial dignity, though during fifteen years he was only the colleague of his mother the celebrated Maria Theresa. Mr. Coxe has justly characterised this prince as noted for a restless spirit of innovation[19], which was impatient of all existing regulations, and for a perfidious duplicity, which was regardless of the most solemn engagements. These fatal propensities were in some degree controlled by the long tutelage, in which he was retained by the empress-queen; but the artful Frederic contrived to avail himself of them, even within that period, for engaging him in the spoliation of Poland, and, when another opportunity of unjust aggrandisement appeared to present itself, the emperor forced his reluctant mother into new hostilities.

The object, which on this other occasion excited the ambition of the emperor, was the acquisition of Bavaria, which seemed to be placed within his grasp by the death of the elector, who had left no male issue. A claim was accordingly advanced[20], which would have procured for him immediately almost the half of the electorate, and would have so much embarrassed the remainder, as to facilitate the acquisition of the whole by a projected exchange of territory. The acquisition would not only have added much to the power of the house of Austria, but would also have connected with the centre of the monarchy the valuable demesnes, which it possessed in Suabia.

To avert the opposition of the rival of Austria, Joseph tried upon Frederic the operation of that accommodating system of partitioning[21], which he had learned from that

[18] Francis, grand-duke of Tuscany, who had married Maria Theresa in the reign of the emperor Charles VI., but even after the death of that prince had never enjoyed much influence, though about five years after that event he was associated with his consort in the imperial dignity.

[19] Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 629.

[20] The succession belonged rightfully to the elector-palatine, as the chief of the elder branch of the family. Joseph II. on the other hand claimed all the fiefs of the empire, which preceding emperors had bestowed on the Bavarian branch, without naming in the investitures the palatine princes of the family. The empress Maria Theresa at the same time claimed all the districts, which had been held by another line, extinct in the year 1425, alleging a pretended investiture, granted by the emperor Sigismond in the following year to his son-in-law Albert duke of Austria.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. pp. 419, 420.

[21] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 528.

prince, offering to acquiesce in certain plans of aggrandisement of the territories of the king of Prussia, in return for his concurrence in the appropriation of Bavaria. But the circumstances did not appear to that wily sovereign to be similar. He felt it more suitable to his interest to assume the character of champion of the Germanic liberties[22], and the emperor, after a short struggle, was forced to content himself with a very moderate portion of the territory[23], which he had hoped to engross.

Though Joseph had been disappointed in this effort, he did not relinquish the object, and the failure appears only to have directed his thoughts to another method of accomplishing his purpose. He proposed accordingly to exchange for the desired territory the provinces of the Netherlands[24], a proposal directly repugnant to the barrier-treaty, which had transferred these provinces to the empire on the express condition of holding them for the protection of the United Provinces. The same difficulty, which had frustrated the former project, proved fatal also to this new speculation; but, in preparing to accomplish it, the emperor had dismantled the strong places, and expelled the Dutch garrisons.

Though the alliance formed between France and Austria was in truth inconsistent with the provisions of the barrier-treaty, this had not been formally abrogated by Maria Theresa[25], who was busily engaged in opposing the aggrandisement of Prussia, in securing her share of the partition of Poland, and in arranging the treaty of Teschen, which adjusted her differences with Frederic, and was also unwilling to offend the maritime powers, and attach herself wholly to France. The restless rapacity of Joseph II., however, completed what had been begun by the alliance of the year 1756. Having come into the possession of the imperial power in the year 1780, on the death of Maria Theresa, he proceeded immediately to execute his plans of innovation. The barrier

[22] However in the treaty of Teschen he secured this very advantage, the empress-queen then engaging not to oppose the reunion of the margravates of Anspach and Bareith to the electoral dominions of the house of Brandenburg, the territories before offered.—Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. pp. 528, 538. [23] This portion was about a sixteenth part, whereas that which he had already occupied, was nearly a half.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 152. [24] Ibid., pp. 154—156. [25] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. pp. 584, 585.

was in the following year dismantled[26], and deprived of its garrisons; and then the political constitution of the Netherlands was shaken to its foundation[27], and a way prepared by speculative alterations for the jacobinism of France.

The dominions of the Austrian government were singularly various, ten principal languages being spoken in the heterogeneous provinces[28], of which they were composed, and these provinces being in other respects also as distinct as so many nations. In these territories many grievances required to be remedied, and Maria Theresa had begun a plan of gradual reformation, by reducing the enormous privileges of the nobility and clergy, and alleviating the oppressions of the peasants. A gradual reformation was however too slow for the ardent spirit of Joseph II., which was captivated by the project of reducing the discordancy of his dominions to one simple system of administration. He accordingly published a new plan of government, which altered in almost every particular the civil and ecclesiastical establishments, and, though with some few changes really beneficial, was an extraordinary specimen of rapacious despotism combined with speculative innovation. Eager for power, he was led either to suppress the provincial states, or to render them inefficient by novel modifications, and he made the absolute will of the sovereign the basis of the administration. Enthusiastic in his admiration of the French economists, he adopted into his constitutions many of their wildest extravagancies; he abo-

[26] In the years 1783 and 1784 he attempted to abrogate the barrier-treaty in fact, by extending the limits of Austrian Flanders at the expense of the United Provinces, and by requiring that the navigation of the Scheldt should be free. This project however he was compelled by the French court to relinquish, that court being desirous of conciliating the United Provinces, with which it was then concluding an alliance for weakening the British power in the East Indies.—Coxe's Hist. of Austria. vol. ii. pp. 589—591. [27] 'He formed the grand, but impracticable plan, of abolishing all distinctions of religion, language, and manners, by declaring that in future there should be no more provinces, but one nation, one family, and one empire. He first abolished the numerous and separate jurisdictions, and divided the Austrian monarchy into thirteen governments, each of which was subdivided into a certain number of circles, or districts, proportionate to its extent.'—Ibid., pp. 572, 573. [28] German, Hungarian, Sclavonian, (including the Polish, Bohemian, and Illyrian dialects.) Latin, Walachian, Turkish, Modern Greek, Italian, Flemish, and French.—Ibid., p. 573.

lished the right of primogeniture, he declared marriage a merely civil contract, he facilitated divorces, and he rendered bastards capable of inheriting. The French writer of his life observes with triumphant satisfaction, that almost all the regulations of the national assembly of his own country had been sketched by this emperor; and Brissot has characterised him as a greedy despot, covering his rapacity with a mask of philosophy.

The imperial plan of levelling reformation was extended to the Netherlands, where the extraordinary denseness of the population and the wide diffusion of comfort afforded incontestable proof, that the existing government was neither ill adapted to the people, nor ill administered by the rulers; and it was accordingly encountered with that strenuous resistance, which might have been expected from a people satisfied with their actual situation, and jealous of their numerous privileges. At an early period of his reign he began his operations by abolishing convents, prohibiting processions and other ecclesiastical practices, and removing images from the churches. In the year 1786 he made a direct attack upon the clergy by abrogating the privileges of the university of Louvain, and instituting another seminary, over which he placed foreigners independent of the bishops. The clergy of these provinces possessing almost unbounded influence, such an attack would naturally excite a most violent discontent. In the following year new causes of irritation were added by the arbitrary suppression of the civil constitutions, and the indignation of the people of the Netherlands broke out into open resistance.

The insurrection of the Netherlands might perhaps have of itself broken up the system of Europe, by establishing in its centre an independent republic, if grief, occasioned by the multiplied embarrassments, in which he had involved himself, had not brought the emperor to his grave within four months from the commencement of hostilities. He was in the year 1790 succeeded by his brother, Leopold II., whose mildness and discretion conciliated his revolted subjects, and recovered this valuable portion of the dominions of his family.

The moderation and prudence of Leopold might have been insufficient for accomplishing the recovery of the Nether-

lands, if they had not been aided by an apprehension, which neutralised the efforts of the insurgents, and even determined these states to solicit the mediation of the maritime powers, for effecting the re-establishment of their connexion with the other dominions of Austria. Such a commotion could not arise in a territory adjacent to France, at this time agitated by the first movements of the revolution, without deriving from it some portion of revolutionary feeling. The constitutions however of the Netherlands, though republican, were aristocratic; and, when the appeal had been made to the people, that people soon learned from the example of their neighbours to inveigh against the restrictions of the very governments, for the maintenance of which they had but a short time before been willing to expose themselves to every danger. A democratic party was accordingly formed, and the insurgents became divided into two hostile and irreconcileable factions. In this crisis the stroke of death removed the sovereign, by whose wild oppression the insurrection had been originally excited, and might still have been maintained. The vigour of the resistance opposed to the measures of the emperor, was abated by that event, and the offer of restoring the provinces to their former condition, which was made by the new emperor, was after some hesitation accepted.

In treating of this insurrection the honourable testimony should not be omitted, which was borne by the Belgic deputies at the Hague to the good faith and consistency of the British government[29], which, they said, had never encouraged it in its outset, nor fed them with false hopes in its progress; but had on every occasion exhorted them to return to their allegiance, and expressed an earnest desire to assist them in recovering and securing their ancient and legal constitution. The policy of the British government was the legitimate and salutary plan of restoring, as much as was possible, the combination of that arrangement of states, which had existed in Europe during the preceding century, but was then menaced with dissolution. Prussia, actuated by its jealousy of Austria, appears to have encouraged an insurrection, which promised to diminish the power of the rival state; Great Britain, though alienated from Austria by the French

[29] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 692.

alliance, interfered only, as became its position in the general system, for the re-establishment of a barrier, which had been opposed to the ambition of France, and might again afford protection.

Unfortunately for Austria and for Europe, the emperor was not actuated by a policy similar to that of Great Britain. As much attached [30], as his brother and predecessor, to the alliance of France, he looked to it for the future safety of the Netherlands, and evaded the offered guaranty of the maritime powers and of Prussia. For the barrier-treaty he inherited the aversion of Joseph II., regarding it as an unnecessary dereliction of the natural advantages of his dominions; and the guaranty of Prussia he was more especially anxious to avoid, as it would have subjected him to the interference of a formidable rival. He contrived at the same time to alienate the returning affections of his subjects in the very moment of reconciliation. Though he had originally consented to restore to the Netherlands their ancient constitution [31], he could not afterwards be induced to restore it in any other form, than as it had existed at the close of the reign of Maria Theresa, before the more grievous innovations of his immediate predecessor. Nor was this disappointment left to act alone upon the still rankling jealousies of the Netherlands, being accompanied by some proceedings of a violent character [32], well fitted to irritate every principle of disaffection. By this injudicious conduct of the emperor the democratic spirit, which had been excited in the insurrection, was cherished and maintained; the confidence and cordial attachment of the maritime powers were at the same time forfeited by his abandonment of the connexion in declining their guaranty; and the system, wholly loosened in this its main articulation, appears to have from this time merely awaited the violence, by which it was in a very few years dissipated and destroyed.

The very different characters of Frederic and of Joseph

[30] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 697. [31] Ibid., p. 695.

[32] Two obnoxious members of the council of Brabant were removed; and, when the states presented a violent protest against this measure, and proceeded to other acts of determined opposition, the suspension of their sittings, the erasure of their protests from the journals, and the arrest of four of their members, increased the irritation.—Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. ii. p. 696.

were equally accommodated to the work of destruction. The crafty ability of the former introduced a practice of spoliation, which ruined the principle of federative protection; the restless incapacity of the other destroyed the grand link of the system by convulsing the Netherlands with rebellion. The process of dissolution had however been begun when the altered circumstances of Germany disposed the court of Vienna to enter into an alliance with France; and the usurping violence of the king, and the innovating vanity of the emperor, but hastened a catastrophe, which must have ensued without their interposition.

That the catastrophe of a decaying system should be hastened, may be considered as of itself agreeable to the plan of a beneficent providence, inasmuch as the principles of renovation may be better preserved in a contracted period of decay and dissolution. The means by which it was thus hastened, may also have had an important operation in so modifying the result, as to render it more favourable to human improvement. If, in the disorganised state of the constitution of the empire, a king of Prussia had not first strengthened his scattered territories by the usurpation of Silesia, and then awed the encroaching empire of Russia into a partition of Poland, that government, which under the ambitious Catherine embraced every pretext for interfering in the concerns of Germany, might first have possessed itself of the whole of Poland, and then have pushed its inroads into the centre of the southern system. In this case the system of Europe might have been as effectually destroyed, as by the revolution of France, but without similar tendencies to restoration; the extravagancies of democratic innovation might not have instructed the world in the mischiefs of speculative changes of government; the blasphemies of an infidel philosophy might not have shocked it into a sober sense of religious obligation. The power of Russia has indeed been usefully employed in crushing the despotism, which followed a republican revolution; but it was only capable of crushing with brute force, as it was far less civilised than the system to be destroyed.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the history of the Northern System, from the treaty of Nystadt, concluded in the year 1721, *to the death of the empress Catherine II. in the year* 1796.

Catherine II. empress of Russia in the year 1762—War of Russia with Turkey, 1768—The first partition of Poland, 1772—The peace of Kainardshi, 1774—The armed neutrality, 1780—The Russian armament of Great Britain, 1791—The peace of Yassy, 1792—The second partition of Poland, 1793.

While the principles of the southern system of Europe were losing their influence, and the combination, which bound together its several interests, was suffering a gradual relaxation, the northern was progressive in its formation, the empire of Russia, which was its principal member, and the aggrandisement of which appears to have been its function, continually increasing in resources and advancing in improvement. The difference well befitted a system, which should interpose with effect in restraining the evils of the dissolution of the other, and probably furnish the predominant and controlling power of a new and more comprehensive confederacy of states, in a future arrangement of a balanced policy.

The northern system had not been, in any period of its existence, a system of equilibrium, nor had it a tendency towards such an arrangement. Russia on the contrary was by the treaty of Nystadt established in an ascendency, which the lesser governments of Sweden and Denmark could not aspire to control; and, in a general view of the policy of Europe, that government might thenceforward be conceived to resemble one of those exterior bodies of the planetary system, which carry with them through their orbits a number of attendant satellites, without being themselves perceptibly influenced by their action. Such a system was not liable to be destroyed by a disturbance of any federal relations, but could lose its existence only by the absorption of the secondary governments into the principal, or by such a

change of the general policy, as should involve the principal government in the combinations of the other system, and thus put an end to the distinctness of that of the north. It was in this latter manner, that the northern system did actually tend towards its destruction. As the empire of Russia increased in power, it tended continually to involve itself in the relations of the southern governments, so that at length, immediately before the struggle of the French revolution, the British minister judged it necessary to oppose a powerful confederacy to the further advances of this northern sovereignty.

The emperor Peter survived the treaty of Nystadt little more than three years. In that short interval however, and, immediately after the termination of his western hostilities, he engaged in an expedition for extending his dominion on the other side of his immense territory. In the earlier part of his reign he had acquired the command of the Black Sea by obtaining the possession of Azof, but was afterwards forced to restore that place, nor was it permanently acquired by Russia before the year 1774, when it was ceded by the treaty of Kainardshi. The object of Peter, in this his last enterprise, was to establish his power in the countries adjacent to the Caspian, that he might extend and secure the oriental commerce of his subjects.

The Black Sea and the Caspian are the seas, which promise to Russia its most considerable aggrandisement. The Baltic, in which navigation is by the influence of climate obstructed during many months of every year, is naturally unfitted for becoming the scene of any great maritime dominion. The acquisition of a communication with that sea was important to Russia, as it would connect the country with the western governments, and convey to it the habits and the improvements of a European nation. But it seems to be in other directions, that Russia is by nature destined to seek the greatness, to which its prodigious resources encourage it to aspire, because it might there be furnished with free communications, which would easily connect it with the central and eastern territories of the ancient world.

The distractions of Persia had seemed to present to Peter a favourable opportunity for his eastern enterprise, and he had even been invited to assist with his forces the miserable

descendant of the sophis[1], whose throne was shaken by the assaults of rebellious subjects. But he was soon obliged to set limits to his acquisitions[2], that he might not too much alarm the jealous apprehension of the Turks. The provinces which he did acquire, were afterwards abandoned by Russia, as not compensating the efforts necessary for their protection. The enterprise, by which they had been added to the empire, appears thus to have been premature, like other exertions made by this monarch for the improvement of his dominions, which served rather to point the way to his successors, than actually to advance in the career.

Peter died in the beginning of the year 1725, from which time to the latter part of the year 1796, with only three short interruptions, making together about four years, was the throne of this great empire occupied by female sovereigns. For this remarkable peculiarity in the Russian succession that monarch appears to have prepared the way by the solemnity of crowning his wife Catherine, which he celebrated with unwonted magnificence a few months before his decease. It is indeed probable, that he then intended to designate the empress as his successor[3]; and, though an intrigue, in which she was soon afterwards detected, deprived her of his favour, she yet found means to place herself after his decease upon the throne, which she occupied between two and three years. As the coronation solemnised by Peter had facilitated her elevation, so the immediate circumstances of that elevation set an example of usurped power, which was imitated by two of her female successors, Elizabeth and the celebrated Catherine II.

In reviewing the history of Russia during the eighteenth century, our attention is divided between the reign of Peter, with which that century was begun, and that of the second Catherine, which reached near to its termination. Between these two memorable reigns intervened thirty-seven years, which, though not disgraced by any national humiliation, were yet so inferior to these reigns in the energy of the government, that they suggest the idea of a long interregnum. Of these thirty-seven years all except four were occupied by female reigns, and these four were di-

[1] Levesque, tome v. pp. 121, 122. [2] Ibid., pp. 122—124.
[3] Ibid., p. 131.

vided among the reigns of two minor princes, and the yet more transient sovereignty of the husband of the second Catherine. Under this series of inefficient rulers Russia seems to have found leisure to repose itself after the violent exertions of Peter, and to prepare itself for the long and active career, in which it was afterwards engaged by Catherine. Peter has been blamed for endeavouring to force upon his country improvements, which it was not then fitted to receive. The violence, which he employed, was probably necessary for subduing the intractable materials, on which he operated; but such treatment, to be beneficial, must be only occasional and of short continuance. The wars too, by which he began the greatness of his country, would have proved ruinous, if protracted beyond his reign. An interval of tranquillity was on this account necessary for repairing the breaches of the empire, and for giving consistency and stability to the fabric of power, which had been raised by his successes.

Amidst all this inefficiency of government the importance of the nation was still maintained. It was in one of the short regencies that Kouli-khan, the usurper of Persia, after he had conquered the Mogul, deemed it expedient to send a respectful deputation to the Russian sovereign[4]. It was one of the female monarchs[5], who enforced the election of the last of the Saxon sovereigns of Poland, in opposition to the wishes of the Poles and the intrigues of France. It was another of them[6], who repressed the undue pretensions of the Swedes, though they had armed to place her on the throne, and who drove the king of Prussia to the verge of destruction[7], from which he was rescued only by her death and the accession of Peter III., his enthusiastic admirer. Russia was in this interval a mighty mass, exerting little external vigour in proportion to its magnitude, but by its mere weight capable of making a formidable impression.

Nor was the internal improvement of Russia entirely stationary during this period of comparative quiescence.

[4] Levesque, tome v. p. 250. [5] The empress Anne.—Ibid., pp. 226—231. [6] The empress Elizabeth. The Swedes demanded Vyburgh and all Finland, as the reward of their service. She offered money which was refused.—Ibid., p. 272. [7] Ibid., p. 288.

The first Catherine, or her minister Menchikof, fulfilled in her short reign the intention of her husband by establishing the academy of sciences[8], among the original members of which she enrolled the two Bernouillis, distinguished for their mathematical attainments; and Elizabeth instituted the university of Moscow, and the academy of the fine arts at Petersburgh[9]. Even the weak and unfortunate husband of the second Catherine distinguished his transitory government by suppressing the secret chancery, which was a most terrible state-inquisition, and by freeing the nobles from various restrictions, which had reduced them to a state of decorated servitude[10].

In reviewing the series of six sovereigns, who reigned in the interval between the death of Peter I. and the advancement of Catherine II. to the throne, it is obvious to remark, that the reigns of the females were separated by the very fleeting reigns of minors, or the yet more transient government of the unhappy husband of Catherine. Between the first Catherine and Anne intervened Peter II., who began his reign at the age of twelve years, and concluded it after little more than two years and a half. Between Anne again and Elizabeth intervened Ivan VI., who at his accession was only two months old, and was deposed by Elizabeth at the end of about thirteen. Between Elizabeth, lastly, and Catherine II. intervened Peter III., who at the expiration of six months was displaced by his consort, and afterwards experienced how short is the passage from the prison of a sovereign to his tomb. It is surely no refinement to remark, how much a succession so curiously alternated must have tended to reconcile the rude subjects of this government to the dominion of a female. At every interval the imperial power reverted to a male, but to a male so weak and transitory, that he seems to have been placed upon the throne for no other purpose, than to afford an advantageous comparison to a female successor. The respective durations also of the female reigns correspond to such a discipline of preparation. Catherine, the first in the series, reigned little more than two years; Anne, the second, governed during the longer period of ten; Eli-

8 Levesque, tome v. p. 207. 9 Ibid., p. 282. 10 Ibid., p. 290.

zabeth, who was the third, held the reigns of empire twenty. It is also remarkable that, while these female reigns were thus increasing in length, the short male governments, with which they were alternated, were gradually diminishing, from two years and a half to thirteen months, and from thirteen months to six. It may be added, that these male reigns were at the same time descending from an almost adult minor to an infant, and from an infant to a man, whose maturity served only to exhibit confirmed and hopeless incapacity.

There was also, it may be observed, a curious progression in the circumstances, in which the Russian empresses were placed upon the throne, ending in direct usurpation. The first Catherine had been, as it were, designated to the succession by a solemn coronation, which had been announced by her husband in a manifesto, extolling the services rendered by her fortitude to himself and to the state[11]. She had not however been expressly nominated by him to the succession, as his own law required; and the rupture, which occurred between them immediately after the coronation, might render it questionable, whether this had been his ultimate determination. He died, it is said, uttering an unfinished sentence, which left everything uncertain[12]. Catherine in these circumstances took possession of the throne by an usurpation, which had some semblance of a rightful succession. She was herself regularly succeeded by the son of her unfortunate step-son, to whom she had bequeathed the crown; but, this young prince having died without making a similar appointment, one of the nieces of Peter was placed upon the throne by an election of the nobles. This princess again was succeeded by Ivan, the infant son of her niece, whom she had regularly nominated, agreeably to the ordinance of Peter: and the unhappy child was deposed and imprisoned by Elizabeth, one of the daughters of that emperor. Elizabeth did not, like Anne, resort to an election, but claimed the succession as a right of inheritance, though the law issued by her father had determined, that the crown should be transmitted by the testament of the reigning sovereign. The empresses had now proceeded from an irregular and questionable succession to

[11] Levesque, tome v. pp. 127, 128. [12] Ibid., p. 202.

an election, and from this to a deposition of the actual sovereign, cloaked however by a plea of lineal inheritance. The elevation of the second Catherine combined all the irregularities of the three cases, aggravated by special disadvantages, and so constituted a proceeding, to which these appear to have been separately preparatory. Like the first Catherine, she was an alien to the royal blood of Russia, but without the advantage of an antecedent coronation; like Elizabeth, she deposed the reigning sovereign, though she could not urge the plea of a lineal succession; and, like Anne, she trusted her pretensions to an election, but to an election of the imperial guards, not of the nobles of the empire. When it is considered that, in the very crisis of the revolution, count Panin represented to her, that her complete success was hopeless[13], it cannot be thought that all this various apparatus was disproportioned to the result.

The empire, to the government of which Catherine thus succeeded, is a phenomenon in the history of human society. Such is its extent that, like the terraqueous globe itself, its dimensions are estimated by degrees of longitude and latitude, rather than by the puny measurements, which determine the magnitudes of other dominions. Such is the variety of its people, that it presents to the view of the philosopher an entire scale of the gradations of human refinement and barbarism, from the lettered and luxurious capital of a European monarchy to the horde of the vagrant Tatar, and the yet lower savageness of the forlorn Kamschatkan. A European empire on the one hand, on the other an Asiatic, and reaching almost to the shore of America, it embraces within its immense vicinage three of the four regions of the inhabited world. Bounded on the north by the everlasting frosts of the polar ocean, and on the south descending into the milder climates, it comprehends almost all the various productions, by which nations are enriched. Almost unassailable on account of the inclemency of much of its climates, the wildness of much of its territory, and even the vastness

[13] Panin urged, that the Russians would never submit to be governed solely by a stranger, acknowledging for their sovereign a countess of Anhalt. He therefore advised that Catherine should assume the government as regent for her son.—Tooke's Life of the Empress Catherine, vol. i. pp. 236, 237. Lond. 1799.

of its magnitude, it seems to menace all other governments without being endangered by their attacks. In whatever view we contemplate it, we behold something gigantic, and we look with apprehension to the time, when it shall put forth all its formidable energies.

In the important period, which prepared and began the great crisis of Europe, it was the fortune of this empire to be governed by a woman, but by a woman of no ordinary mind. From the usurper, who dethroned her husband, and supplanted her son, we must turn with abhorrence, notwithstanding the ability which she displayed in the struggle. From the shameless wanton, who even constituted the objects of her licentious passion acknowledged officers of her court, and shifted them without scruple to stimulate a flagging appetite, we must recoil with unmingled disgust. The foreign administration too of Catherine was one continued series of unwarrantable encroachments on the independence of the neighbouring states, violating every principle of national security and of conventional policy. But, notwithstanding all these abatements for public and private misconduct, we cannot refuse the tribute of our admiration to a sovereign, who with successful activity wielded during thirty-four years the power of such a huge disjointed empire, who laboured to introduce among its untutored boiars and servile vassals the knowledge of a regulated and liberal constitution of government, and who exerted her utmost efforts to naturalise the literature of southern Europe on the ungenial banks of the Neva. Even the violence and the sensuality of Catherine were indirectly auxiliary to her claims on our admiration. The consciousness of the unauthorised means, by which she had effected her advancement, urged her to incessant and unwearied efforts for conciliating the affections of her subjects, and for covering with a blaze of glory the imperfection of her title; and the vulgar sensuality of her attachments effectually guarded her from the danger of confounding the character of the favourite with that of the minister, and suffering her public conduct to be influenced by her affections. Her vanity also contributed to the splendour of her government, as it sought its gratification in the applause of writers, who might influence the suffrages of the civilised world.

If we compare Peter, who began the greatness of Russia, with Catherine, by whom it was vastly augmented, we see in each an eager desire of encouraging every improvement, and in each the same grasping and forecasting ambition; yet in every other particular we observe them as much contrasted, as in sex. The stern despotism of Peter disregarded the ceremonial of a court, but the voluptuous elegance of Catherine delighted in the splendid pageantries of public entertainments. Peter again endeavoured to awe his subjects into civilisation by the terrors of his severity, but Catherine studied to win them to improvement by the gentle arts of conciliation. These differences however corresponded to the different periods, in which they held the government. The mildness and splendour of Catherine could not have broken down the barbarism of the Russians, nor could the headlong violence of Peter have led them onward to refinement.

At the time of the death of Catherine II. Russia had, with scarcely any interruption, been subject about seventy years to the government of females, the reign of that empress however having occupied about one half of the period. In estimating the general bearing of this extraordinary case of female succession, we must exclude the consideration of the public measures of the state, for, though in each of the other female reigns we find a period of comparative inertness and repose, this cannot be said of the last, nor indeed is any influence of sex discoverable in the public measures of the second Catherine. For an influence of sex, which might be ascribed also to this sovereign, we must look exclusively to the manners of the Russian court; and, to judge of its expediency in the whole series of the Russian empresses, we should consider the previous condition of the nation in regard to its social habitudes.

The northern empire, it must be remembered, had no period of chivalrous refinement, to introduce a fantastic reverence for the female sex, which might be gradually depurated into a reasonable regard. The feudal habits of France and Italy had not been extended to Russia, nor had a conflict waged with the enemies of the Christian faith, served in that country to exalt into a devotional sentiment the gallantry of a military people. A peculiar process was accordingly required, for giving to the women that degree

of importance, which belongs to them in a period of refinement; and this appears to have consisted in the extraordinary succession of female sovereigns, which followed the first considerable efforts of improvement, made in the reign of Peter.

This peculiar influence of female government was observable at least so early as in the commencement of the reign of Anne, or about the year 1730, when a passion for magnificence began to prevail in the court of Russia, though perpetually contrasted with instances of squalid rudeness. At this time too, when that court was disgraced by habits of the most excessive inebriety, the example and authority of an empress, who hated drunkenness, must at least have given some beginning to a reformation of the national manners. The voluptuous sensuality of Elizabeth and Catherine II., in a moral view, admit no extenuation: but, as one poison has sometimes been said to expel another, so may the example of sensuality have been, amidst so much barbarism, the only stimulant of efficacy sufficient to rouse the court of Russia from the more hopeless brutality of intoxication. The sensuality of Catherine in particular, however vulgar in the selection of its objects, was not openly opposed to the observances of decorum. The public deportment of that empress was regulated by the most rigorous propriety, and to the general observation her gratification seemed to consist in enjoying those magnificent pageantries, which amuse and improve the childishness of nations, equally as of individuals.

If we pass from the consideration of the sex of Catherine, and regard her merely as a sovereign directing the government of an extensive empire, we must rank her among the foremost of the claimants of renown. We see her assiduous in multiplying and enlarging the opportunities of education, inviting learned men from every part of Europe to a hospitable asylum in her court, and granting pensions to the distinguished pupils of the academy of arts, that they might travel for improvement into countries of more advanced refinement. We see her prosecuting with distinguished success those investigations of her remoter territories[14], which had been begun by Peter, investigations deeply impressing us with a sense of the magnitude of an empire, in which it

[14] Tooke's Hist. of Russia, vol. i. pp. 360, &c. Dublin.

could be necessary to send out various expeditions of discovery within its limits. The empress Elizabeth had before her proposed to abolish capital punishments[15]; but she had suffered criminals to be deprived of life by the barbarous punishment of the knoot, and the administration of justice in the reign of that empress had been also disgraced by other instances of severity. Catherine first prohibited the use of torture in all criminal cases, and, without any ostentation of humanity in protesting against capital punishment, infused a real mildness into the judicial system of her empire. These indeed were efforts of a reformation, which a despot might easily be conceived capable of exerting, as tending even to render the possession of power more secure. Catherine however did much more, for she endeavoured to introduce among her subjects the habits and the principles of a liberal constitution of government. The assembly of deputies, which she convened from all the provinces of her empire, though a premature, was yet an honourable effort, to enlighten the political views of her people: the instructions, which she had caused to be composed for the guidance of that assembly, though apparently not productive of any immediate effect, could scarcely have failed to sow the seeds of political improvement for a future period: and it should be remembered to the credit of the autocratrix of all the Russias, that a Russian translation of Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England was published with her sanction[16], as if to afford to her subjects an opportunity of studying the practical administration of a balanced government.

The objectionable part of the government of this empress related to the foreign concerns, not to the internal administration of the empire. She appears to have been perpetually apprehensive, that she should be overlooked and forgotten in the political relations of Europe. So anxious indeed was she to assume a rank among European nations, that the first chapter of her celebrated instructions for framing a code of laws, is employed in proving that Russia is a European state. For supporting this pretension of European importance, and also for gratifying an ambition, which dominions of

[15] Tooke's Hist. of Russia, vol. i. pp. 114, 115. [16] Ibid., vol. iii. pp. 305, 306.

scarcely discovered vastness could not satisfy, she was unceasingly engaged in foreign interferences and encroachments, employing alternately the artifices of secret intrigue and the violences of open and audacious usurpation. The Russian government accordingly became, under her direction, a power of pestilent activity to the existing relations of Europe, disturbing the settled affinities and antipathies of its states, and confounding the acknowledged principles of international policy. The body, which had heretofore moved in its distant orbit, composing with its attendant satellites a separate combination, burst from its former path, and carried disorder among the other members of the general system.

The first object of the foreign policy of Catherine appears to have been the assumption of a more direct dominion over the unfortunate kingdom of Poland, which is said to have been suggested to her by the crafty Frederic of Prussia. The anarchy, into which this once powerful monarchy had fallen, presented it an easy prey to her ambition, while its local situation, interposed as it was on the one hand between her empire and Germany, and on the other facilitating, or impeding, her approaches towards Constantinople, constituted it the highway to the attainment of importance in the west, and of dominion in the east of Europe. In the second year of her reign, the death of the third of the Saxon sovereigns of Poland afforded an opportunity of interfering in the concerns of that country, which she eagerly embraced; and, after a struggle of about a year, she enforced the election of Poniatofsky, one of her discarded favourites, having previously procured from the courts of Vienna and Versailles a declaration of neutrality[17], made by them in the hope of detaching her from the interest of the king of Prussia. Whether the interposition of Catherine had been really suggested by Frederic, or not, it is certain that she shortly afterwards concluded with this monarch a definitive alliance, guaranteeing the continuance of that elective government, which was a principal cause of the weakness of Poland. Her choice of Poniatofsky was well adapted to her purpose of encroachment. Possessing external graces and specious accomplishments, but destitute of talents and of energy, he was a theatrical, rather than a real sovereign,

[17] Tooke's Hist. of Russia, vol. i. pp. 282, 283.

fitted to attract the regards of an unthinking multitude, not to struggle with the difficulties of the country, if he could have been really disposed to maintain the independence of his crown.

The Austrian alliance of France, which by relaxing the barrier-treaty had so fatally enfeebled the federal relations of the southern states, appears to have been also among the northern powers destructive of the existing combinations, for it detached the French court from the interest of Poland, and induced it to abandon that country to Russia, during the struggle with the Prussian monarch. The French court was at length roused to apprehension of the progress of Russia, and in the year 1768 excited the Turks to declare war against Catherine. The effect however was only to determine Catherine to divide with Frederic the prey, which she had proposed to engross.

The first adjustment of the northern governments was made by the treaty of Oliva, as that of the south had been arranged by the treaty of Westphalia; and, as the treaty of Utrecht had introduced a new arrangement of power in the place of the latter of these two treaties, so in the north had the treaty of Nystadt been the epoch of an important modification of that of Oliva. In the two fundamental treaties, of Oliva and Nystadt, by which the northern interests of Europe were thus successively adjusted, the independence and integrity of Poland had been expressly guaranteed. By the former the ascendency of the north had been transferred from Poland to Sweden, but the territory of Poland, as regulated by that treaty, was guaranteed by the contracting parties. In the treaty of Nystadt again, which transferred the ascendency from Sweden to Russia, Poland was included as allied to the czar, and the king of Sweden was bound to conclude a durable peace with that country under his mediation. It appears therefore that the partition of Poland, while it violated every principle of general security, was a special and direct infringement of the two conventions, upon which the northern system had been established.

The Turkish war, though it clashed with this primary object of Catherine, opened to her a prospect more inviting to her ambition. In the very commencement of her reign the scheme of driving the Turks from Europe had been sug-

gested to her by marshal Munich[18], who had conceived it when an exile in Siberia. She was therefore prepared to avail herself of the occasion afforded by the aggression of that people, and at once determined to excite an insurrection of the Greeks, of whose independence she professed herself the protector. The Greeks however, though they obeyed with alacrity the call of freedom, were ill qualified to maintain the pretension[19]. More inclined to pillage than to fighting, they showed themselves destitute, not merely of discipline, but also of courage. In Egypt a revolution begun by Ali-bey[20], who meditated to render that country once more the intermediate station of European and Asiatic commerce, was supported by the Russians during three years; but in this instance[21] their own want of skill appears to have hindered them from profiting by their successes, and the death of the bold adventurer put an end to their hopes. The peace of Kainardshi, concluded in the year 1774, terminated this Turkish war, when it had lasted about four years and a half.

Though the enterprises of Russia in the Mediterranean had not been successful, important advantages were gained by the war, as the treaty granted to that state the possession of some places which opened to it the commerce of the Black Sea, and established the independence of the Crimea[22], to which, as to another Poland, Catherine became thenceforward a pretended protector, until she should find an opportunity of reducing it under her power.

During her struggle with the Turks the Russian empress had been studious to conciliate the maritime governments, and particularly Great Britain, that her naval expeditions to the Mediterranean might not experience interruption. She had accordingly[23], just before the termination of the Turkish war, concluded a treaty of commerce and alliance with the British government, by which considerable advantages were bestowed upon the British commerce. But her attachment ceased with the occasion; and when, five years afterwards[24], the French had exerted their influence with the court of

[18] Tooke's Hist. of Russia, vol. i. p. 243. [19] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 24. [20] Ibid., pp. 38, &c. [21] Ibid., pp. 34, 100, 101. [22] Ibid., p. 117. [23] Ibid., vol. i. p. 333. [24] Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 273, 293, 294.

Constantinople, in assuaging the jealousy, which her former successes and continued encroachments had excited, and in procuring for her some additional concessions, she was easily induced to adopt the suggestion of their ambassador, and to place herself at the head of an armed neutrality, in opposition to the maritime pretensions and power of Great Britain.

The object of this confederacy was to extort from the distress of the British government, then engaged in the struggle with the revolted colonies of North America, the abolition of two of the established principles of the maritime law of nations[25]. It was required that the property of an enemy should be secure from capture, when in the ship of a neutral trader; and, though Denmark and Sweden acknowledged themselves bound by existing treaties to a different and more comprehensive enumeration of contraband merchandise, Russia, with the other contracting powers, contended for the limitation of this description of goods to mere instruments of war, without including stores necessary for naval equipments. At the suggestion of the king of Prussia another article was added, declaring the Baltic to be a close sea, and excluding from it the armaments of the belligerent powers.

By this great combination, to which even Portugal had been induced to accede, it was hoped that a deadly wound might be inflicted upon the naval superiority of Great Britain. That dominion however survived for another, and yet more arduous struggle. But, though the maritime dominion of Great Britain remained unshaken, the federal system of Europe was then virtually destroyed. The same states, it is true, continued to exist; the same forms of diplomatic intercourse continued to be maintained; but the relations,

[25] To prevent the co-operation of a Russian fleet with the British navy, the French court had, in the year 1754, proposed to the Swedes and Danes to form an armed naval convention for the protection, as was alleged, of the trade of the maritime states, and to maintain the liberty of the Baltic. It was accordingly concluded in the year 1758, under the sanction of France and Prussia; but it was in the following year disconcerted by the successes of the British navy.—Sketches of France and Russia, p. 123. Hague, 1803. The pretension was matured in the American war, which, being purely maritime, had given extraordinary activity to the commerce of the north of Europe, as supplying the materials of naval equipment.—Tabl. des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 445.

which had bound the states of Europe together, and had given order and consistency to their combinations, were then dissolved. Since the wars of the British revolution the British government had been the controlling power, which restrained the excesses of French ambition, and protected the secondary states. In the war of America this arrangement of the general policy was wholly disregarded. The continental governments, instead of seeing the security of their own independence in the maritime superiority of Great Britain, beheld only an opportunity of deriving some immediate advantage from its destruction. Another Poland was to be partitioned by one general confederation of rapacity. The object however of the new conspiracy of spoliation was not a government become, by its inherent disorders, almost superfluous to the general interests of Europe, but the actual dominion of the ocean, the grand support of the equilibrium of the political system. In one respect the confederacy was ruinously effectual. It dissolved the connexion of Great Britain and the Dutch republic[26], and thus afforded to the emperor an opportunity of abrogating the barrier-treaty.

Mr. Pitt appears to have justly appreciated the mischievous tendency of this general derangement of political relations, and to have sought with anxiety for some method of re-establishing the equilibrium, which the interference of Russia had so violently disturbed. The renewal of the war with Turkey presented the occasion. So desirous was Catherine of effecting the conquest of European Turkey, that she had with this view given the name of Constantine to the second of her grandsons, and had caused him to be nursed by Greek women, that he might from his infancy acquire the language of his intended sovereignty.

In the same year, in which this ambitious and enterprising empress placed herself at the head of the armed neutrality, she concluded with the emperor of Germany a partition-treaty for the spoliation of Turkey, the restless and grasping mind of Joseph II. having been easily induced to concur. The king of Prussia, alarmed at the dangerous combination of the two imperial courts, formed a confederacy of the electors and other princes of Germany, to which the king of Great Britain acceded, as elector of Hanover. Though

[26] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. pp. 211, 212.

the alliance of Russia and Austria was concluded in the year 1780, and the former, in reliance upon it, committed various encroachments on the territories of the Turks, that people did not declare war against Russia until the year 1787. In the interval the empress possessed herself of the Crimea, the independence of which had been stipulated, apparently with this very design, in the treaty of Kainardshi, the mediation of France being at this time employed to procure the acquiescence of the Turks. The court of Constantinople at length could no longer endure the encroachments of a government[27], which seemed desirous of driving it to hostility. War was accordingly proclaimed by the Turks, and Mr. Pitt, to restrain the ambition of the northern empire, projected, in concert with Prussia, the well known Russian armament for the protection of their dependencies.

The measures of the confederacy thus formed against Russia were in some respects successful. Sweden was rescued from the Danish allies of the empress[28]; the emperor Leopold, who had succeeded Joseph II., was induced to abandon the project of Turkish spoliation; and the acquisitions even of Russia were limited to the territory of Otchakof. This acquisition the empress would have failed to make, if the British minister had not been forced by the clamour of the opposition, and by the resistance thus excited among the merchants, to relinquish his purposed protection. By this involuntary abandonment of the confederacy[29], though Sweden and Turkey had been saved, the last effort to support a federal system in opposition to a coalition of two great powers was defeated.

The empress was duly sensible of the service, which she had on this occasion received from Mr. Fox, the leader of the opposition-party in the British parliament. His bust

[27] Tooke's Hist. of Russia, vol. iii. pp. 122, 123.

[28] Sweden, by an attempt made on Norway, some years before this time, had given occasion to a strict alliance between Denmark and Russia. Catherine moreover had recently conciliated the Danes by the cession of the patrimonial rights of her son in the duchies of Sleswic and Holstein.—Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 247, 248; vol. iii. pp. 172, &c.

[29] The author was informed by the late lord Redesdale, that Mr. Pitt, a short time before his death, declared that his acquiescence in the opposition given to this measure was the only part of his political conduct, of which he then repented.

was accordingly placed in a conspicuous situation in her favourite retreat, though, for his subsequent opposition to a war with France, it was afterwards, with that of Voltaire, as an instigator of revolution, condemned to obscurity. His confidential friend too, Mr. Adair, whom he had despatched to encourage the empress in her enterprise, was received with distinguished attention, and pointedly preferred to the ambassador of his sovereign.

If any comment be required on the peace, which was thus forced upon the British minister, it may be read in the second partition of Poland, which immediately succeeded. The dismemberment of that country by the earlier spoliation was the first great breach in the federal constitution of Europe. The second partition of it announced the destruction of the system, and for the overbearing violence of revolutionised France it only remained to break up the frame-work.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the history of Colonisation and Commerce, from the British revolution in the year 1688 *to the French revolution in the year* 1789.

Decline of the Mogul empire of India commenced in the year 1707—completed by the invasion of Nadir Shah, 1739—War in India between France and Great Britain, 1744—The battle of Plassey, 1757 ——Louisiana settled, 1698—acquired by France, 1753—Canada and Louisiana acquired by Great Britain, 1759—The American war, 1775—The United States of North America independent, 1783.

An insular government, looking to the extension of its trade, would naturally prefer the islands, as the objects of its enterprises in India. To these accordingly was the attention of the English government early directed. The pre-occupancy of the Dutch however having rendered the scheme of insular settlements impracticable, that government established its factories on the continent of India; and thus the United Provinces, as they had been in Europe the means of engaging Great Britain in the struggles of the

continental states, furnished also in India the immediate occasion, which connect it with the concerns of the eastern continent.

The attention of the English government having thus been directed towards the continent of India, a second impulse was given by the French, which extended the factories of traders into a great empire. Less commercial, and more intriguing and ambitious, than their British rivals, the French first sought to derive advantage from the distractions of the declining empire of the Moguls[1]. The policy adopted by one of the two rival nations became necessary to the security of the other; the arms of France and Great Britain were accordingly opposed in the confused and barbarous struggle of the princes of India; and amidst the blended hostility of the west and of the east were gradually laid the foundations of that extraordinary empire, which our government now holds, at a distance of almost a fourth part of the circumference of the globe, over provinces much more extensive than its original territory[2], containing a population greatly exceeding in number its European subjects.

While the active rivalry of the French was thus urging the British to engage in the quarrels of India, the rapid decline of the Mogul empire was relaxing the subordination of its princes, and reducing the peninsula to a state of anarchy, most favourable to the interposition of the Europeans. The death of Aurungzeb, which happened in the year 1707, has been marked as the epoch of the decline of this eastern sovereignty. After a long and vigorous reign, in which he had crushed both the independent kingdoms of the other Mohammedans of India, and the native principalities, which still maintained themselves in the peninsula, he left his

[1] Maurice, vol. ii. pp. 299, 300.—Sulivan's Analysis of the Polit. Hist. of India, p. 54. [2] The British possessions in India have been estimated by Pinkerton to have contained, in the year 1799, after the reduction of Tippoo, about 212,496 square British miles, or about 75,000 more than are comprised in the United Kingdom; and the population subject to Great Britain was by him supposed to be twelve or fourteen millions, but he has remarked, that by Sir William Jones it was estimated at thirty.—Mod. Geogr., vol. ii. p. 238. At present the estimate even of Sir William Jones is doubled, and the territory extended over almost the whole of India.

throne to the contentions of his children, and his empire to the ambitious enterprises of his subject chieftains and of strangers. The work of ruin, begun by the dissensions of the family of Aurungzeb, was completed[3], thirty-two years after his decease, by the invasion of Thamas Kuli-khan, who had first availed himself of the weakness of the government of Persia to usurp the throne of his sovereign, and then, under the name of Nadir Shah, carried his arms into India. As the irruption of Timur had broken down the earlier empire of Delhi, and had thus prepared the way for the establishment of the Portuguese, so did that other invasion of the Persian usurper inflict on the Mogul empire a wound so deadly, that from this time the dominion of the Moguls can scarcely be considered as existing, being wholly incapable either of resisting the progress of the British, or even of maintaining the authority of its interior government.

An East Indian company was formed in England so early as in the year 1600, but a century elapsed before it attained a stable prosperity. Resisted in India by the Dutch, and enfeebled at home by the public dissensions, it was long unable to effectuate its scheme of sharing largely in the rich commerce of the east; and, though the vigorous government of Cromwell bore down the opposition of the Dutch, and opened to the English the prospect of a successful establishment, the hope thus inspired was in the year 1698 baffled by the competition of a rival company, which for a time obtained a charter investing it with similar powers. The mischief however arising from this competition soon suggested its remedy. The two companies were united in the year 1702, five years before the death of Aurungzeb gave to the empire of the Moguls the epoch of its decay and ruin.

But, though the commercial prosperity of the English company may thus be dated almost from the very commencement of the eighteenth century, its territorial aggrandisement was of a much later origin. The struggle between the companies of France and Great Britain began in the year 1744, when a war, which raged between the governments of

[3] Maurice, vol. ii. p. 286. Thamas Kuli-khan possessed himself of the throne of Persia in the year 1736. In the year 1739 he invaded India.—Hist. of Nadir Shah by James Fraser, pp. 118, 152. Lond., 1742.

the two countries, extended its fury to the distant settlements of their mercantile corporations. It was in this war, that the intriguing spirit of the French at once set the example, and imposed the necessity, of blending the interests of trading companies with the confused and unsteady politics of India. The invasion of Nadir Shah had just before in effect put an end to the Mogul dominion; the authority of the throne of Delhi was thenceforward but a legal fiction, which served to justify the pretensions of some of the numerous claimants of its provinces; and the whole of this vast territory became a scene of tumultuous contention, affording infinite opportunity for the indulgence of a meddling ambition. The battle of Plassey, fought in the year 1757, has been marked as commencing the greatness of the merchant-princes of Britain[4].

The manner, in which this greatness has been acquired, has been at various times the subject of the severest condemnation. It might indeed be presumed that, in these circumstances, the conduct of the British agents would frequently be such, as must incur the reprobation of every moral mind. Far removed from the control of their superiors, and triumphant over the opposition of their rivals, they saw before them a vast and opulent territory, deprived of the protection of its ancient government, and distracted by the interfering pretensions of inferior chieftains. In these circumstances much of that aggrandisement, by which the factories of British traders were gradually transformed into a great empire, must have been effected by violence and usurpation. Much however has resulted from a justifiable self-defence; and in particular an unprovoked seizure of Calcutta[5], in the year 1756, with the cruelty exercised

[4] Maurice, vol. ii. p. 375. The British remained, at the peace of the year 1763, sovereigns of the rich provinces of Bengal, Bahar, and Orissa, of the northern Circars, of part of the Carnatic, and of all their old possessions on the Malabar coast.—Malcolm's Sketch of the Polit. Hist. of India, p. 36. Lond., 1811. Captain Basil Hall, considers this great struggle with the French, as having raised the character of the company from the sordidness of mere traders, by which it had been disgraced. Fragments of Voyages and Travels, 3rd series, vol. i. p. 83. Edinb. and Lond., 1833. [5] Surajah Dowlah, *soubah*, or viceroy, of Bengal, excited, as is thought, by the French, seized Calcutta, and treated the garrison with great cruelty.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 367.

upon the garrison, was the immediate excitement to the conquests effected in that part of India, which formed the commencement of the empire of the company. That[6] the British empire of India, however acquired, shall be rendered the instrument of improvement to the nations of the east, we may be encouraged to hope, if we retain in our recollection, that the British government is the only one registered in the annals of mankind, which in repeated instances has subjected its satraps to public enquiry[7], and in one memorable instance to a most protracted prosecution, not for having neglected the tempting opportunity of aggrandising his country, not for having sacrificed to a timorous moderation the ambitious hopes of his employers, but for having pursued with too much ardour the specific objects of his mission, or for having established the national greatness on the violation of the rights of foreign and distant nations.

The transatlantic settlements of Great Britain, especially on the continent of North America, present an object most completely contrasted to those, which have been hitherto considered, in regard at once to their original circumstances, their formation and character, and the revolution, by which a large portion of them has been dismembered from the parent-state. Yet even between these very remote and heterogeneous dependencies we may observe a very remarkable adaptation of their respective fortunes in their mutual relation, as they were connected with the security and the prosperity of the mother-country. It is most remarkable that the very same war, which sowed the seed of American independence by the British conquest of Canada, crushed the competition of France for dominion in India, and established the ascendency of Great Britain. Preparation was thus made for the aggrandisement of the British nation in the one region, at the very same time when it was also made for the diminution of its possessions in the other; and the general influence of Great Britain on the concerns of the world

[6] The population of the territories forming British India is 89,577,206 souls; the area 514,190 square miles. Including the allied and protected states, the whole area is 1,128,800 square miles. The revenue in 1828-9, was £22,691,721.—Reports of Committees in 1831 and 1832, cited by Captain B. Hall, in Fragments of Voyages and Travels, 3rd series, vol. i. pp. 277, 279. [7] Those of lord Clive, Mr. Hastings, and lord (since marquess) Wellesley.

was accordingly upheld, while the American revolution expanded an indefinite field for the exertions of human industry and improvement.

The whole of the territory [8], which afterwards became that of the American republic, was originally vested by the English government in a company, named the Plymouth-council. It was all comprehended under the name of Virginia, but was gradually divided into several states, administered by governments of the most different kinds. The states of New England, having been colonised by the fugitive Puritans of the mother-country, were formed under chartered constitutions, which assigned to the people a very considerable portion of the powers of the government. Others, as the southern states, remained to a late period subject to proprietary governments, which ceded to individuals a controlling superintendence, properly belonging to the sovereign authority of the empire. Others again, as Virginia, were very early placed under the immediate direction of the crown, with constitutions distinguished by the name of royal governments. All the proprietary governments however were at length transformed into others of this last description, and the chartered and royal governments alone remained.

This distinction of royal and chartered governments, as it corresponded to the division of the parties of the mother-country, appears to have given occasion to that system of commercial restriction, which afterwards constituted the precise relation of the colonies to the parent-state. In the civil distractions of England the royal colony of Virginia, together with that of Barbadoes, in the West Indies, adhered to the royalists, while the republican settlements of New England attached themselves to the party of the parliament. The loyalty of the royal colonies naturally attracted the resentment of the parliament [9], when it had overturned the constitution at home, and an ordinance was issued, which forbad all trade between the colonies and foreign nations, though not enforced against the republicans of New England. After the restoration the policy of the parliament was in this instance, as in the act of navigation, adopted by the legislature, and the ordinance was incorpo-

[8] Account of the European Settlements, vol. ii. pp. 143, &c.
[9] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. pp. 78—80, 166, 167.

rated into that important statute, which thus comprehended in its enactments the regulation of the whole trade of Great Britain, both colonial and domestic.

The monopoly of the colonial trade, which was thus assumed by the mother-country, was not resisted by the colonies, though it was frequently evaded. It was in some degree compensated to the colonists by the preference, which was given to their productions in the British market, and they did not possess any means of enforcing a foreign trade in opposition to the government of Great Britain. The question, upon which they afterwards separated, was not that of commercial restriction, but that of internal taxation. Even the exercise of a power of taxation did not excite a spirit of resistance, so long as it appeared only to be a part of that system of commercial regulation, to which they were accustomed to yield submission. It was when the parliament of Great Britain claimed the power of direct and internal taxation in the American colonies, that a spirit of resistance was awakened, and a revolution occasioned, which gave a beginning to the independence of the western world.

So early as in the year 1692 [10], almost a century before the revolution of North America, did the state of Massachusetts display a spirit of independence. Having recently obtained a new charter from the crown [11], this state proceeded to frame a system of laws for itself, and passed an act maintaining the principles of freedom vindicated in the great charter, and particularly prohibiting to levy taxes without the consent of the government of the colony. To this act the royal assent was refused, though it does not appear, that any design of introducing a system of internal taxation by the mother-country was then entertained. Though thus frustrated, the act was a strong indication of the spirit of the state. Nor was a spirit of independence confined to the

[10] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. p. 305. [11] The charters of the colonies of New England had been abrogated by James II. in pursuance of a plan of Charles II.—Ibid., pp. 223, &c. A new charter was granted to Massachusetts in the year 1692, which reserved to the crown the appointment of governor, deputy-governor, and secretary, and invested the governor with the power of convening, adjourning, proroguing, and dissolving the assembly at pleasure, of appointing solely all military officers, and all officers belonging to the courts of justice with the consent of his council.—Ibid., p. 251.

state of Massachusetts, the colonies in general resisting steadily the unceasing instances of the crown, by which they were urged to make such provision for their governors, as would free these officers from the necessity of courting their favour.

It was remarked by governor Pownall[12], that the relation existing between North America and Great Britain was such, as must necessarily terminate either in an American, or in a British union, either in such a combination of the American states, as would render them independent, or in such an incorporation with the government of the mother-country, as would put an end to the distinctness of their political existence. Adam Smith, who has earnestly recommended the latter measure, has however intimated his opinion[13], that the remote result might be the removal of the seat of empire to the western shore of the Atlantic, as in the course of a century the produce of American might exceed the amount of British taxation, and he conceived that the seat of government would necessarily be transferred to that part of the empire, which should contribute most largely to the general support and defence. The relative powers of the two parts of such a union, to support increased taxation, appear from the experience of nearly the half of the time, which he has specified, to have been much misconceived by this ardent speculator. But, even if his expectation had been in this respect well-founded, it seems much more probable that the transatlantic member of the union would previously detach itself from the rest of the incorporated government, so that the union would only have postponed for a short time an inevitable separation.

The several changes of the government of the mother-country exercised important influences on the connexion, by which the colonies of America were attached to the parent-state. Originally they were considered as belonging exclusively to the sovereign[14], and in no respect connected with the parliament. They had indeed been settled under the express limitation, that their proceedings should not be repugnant to the laws of the mother-country; but they were

[12] The Administration of the British Colonies, dedication, pp. xiii., xiv. London, 1774. [13] Wealth of Nations, vol. ii. p. 134. Dublin, 1785. [14] Pownall's Admin. of the Colonies, vol. i. pp. 120, &c.

notwithstanding regarded as separated from the direct superintendence of the legislature, and attempts made by the parliament to interfere in regulating them were resisted and suppressed by the king, who alleged that the colonies were not yet annexed to the crown, but were of the king's foreign dominions, over which the parliament had no jurisdiction. The subversion of the royal government in England had necessarily the effect of transferring to the parliament the government of the colonies; the sovereignty continued however to be exercised in the same spirit, the change regarding only the governing part of the constitution of the mother-country. When the superintendence of the colonies had thus passed from the sovereign to the parliament, it was natural that, after the re-establishment of the monarchy, it should settle in the middle point of a participated management; and immediately after the restoration accordingly began the system, by which the legislative authority of the parliament was associated with the executive authority of the crown in the regulation of the transatlantic states.

If the government of the mother country had on this occasion acted agreeably to the precedents of the constitution[15], a parliamentary representation would have been granted to the colonies, when they were considered as subject to the authority of the parliament. On this principle it was, that the county palatine of Durham had been, after many efforts, admitted to the right of sending representatives to the house of commons: on the same principle the same right had been extended to the county palatine of Chester: the principality of Wales, already subjected to the crown, had in this manner been incorporated with the realm of England; and an instance is even found of an English colony, settled in Calais, which sent its burgesses to the national council. It is indeed of the very essence of our constitution, that government and representation should be so co-extended, that the exercise of the former should be regulated by an organ sympathising with the various interests of all the portions of the people, and combining them all in one great aggregate of national policy. But it was natural that the application of this great principle should be modified by the situation of those distant pro-

[15] Pownall's Admin. of the Colonies, vol. i. pp. 146, &c.

vinces. Their remoteness, while it required the attention of local governments, and rendered a participation of the representative government of the mother-country very inconvenient, disposed the parliament to claim the exercise of power sufficient for retaining in their connexion with the mother-country provinces which might, on account of that remoteness, be easily detached. Thus the same circumstance of remote situation at once furnished the colonies with habits of local administration, and inspired the mother-country with a disposition to maintain a vigorous control, generating in the two parties at the same time the two contending principles of independence and of sovereignty, and therefore naturally preparing the crisis of an entire separation.

Peculiar circumstances rendered the insular settlements of the West Indies more dependent on the mother-country than the continental colonies of North America. The great expensiveness of the cultivation, in which they were employed, created a dependence on the capitalists of the mother-country; and their insular situation compelled them to rely for protection on the navy of Great Britain, while it also subjected them to its control. Assisted by these circumstances, the English government in the year 1663[16] obtained from the assembly of Barbadoes, and from those of most of the other islands, a grant of four and a half *per cent.*, of all the produce exported, and from Jamaica, though after a contest terminated only in the year 1728, an irrevocable revenue of eight thousand pounds. In this principal colony efforts had been employed in vain to establish a strict dependence of its legislature on the government of England[17] by ordaining that the heads of all bills, except money-bills, should be suggested by the governor and council, and transmitted to England for approbation, before they should be enacted into laws. A perpetual revenue was at the same time required for the crown without success. The law proposed for securing the dependence of the legislature was similar to that law of Poynings, which was long the bond of connexion between England and Ireland; but between England and the western

[16] Edward's Hist. of the West Indies, vol. i. pp. 222, 225, 226. Lond., 1807. [17] Ibid., p. 221.

archipelago the author of nature had interposed the Atlantic, and the legislation of man must yield to the appointments of his Creator.

The original charters of the American colonies had drawn a precise line of distinction between their governments and that of the mother-country[18], assigning to the local administrations the entire right of imposing internal taxes, and subjecting the colonies to the mother-country only in relation to duties to be collected at the ports. The cause of this allowance of the right of internal taxation appears to have been, that originally the colonies were considered as dependent only on the crown, and not as in any manner connected with the parliament of England. When however the parliament at the restoration had been admitted to a share in the government of these dependencies[19], it proceeded to enact various laws for regulating their trade, for controlling their internal measures, and even for declaring the right of taxing them in all cases whatsoever. The declaration of the general right of taxation was indeed long inoperative, the actual exercise of it not having been attempted until the year 1764. The transgression of the original line of demarcation then taught the colonies to disregard that line also on their part, and to deny to the government of the mother-country even the right of imposing external taxes, which had been expressly reserved by the charters. This pretension of the colonies requiring some ingenuity to palliate its novelty, a distinction was invented for the purpose. It was alleged[20], that the colonies ought not to be taxed by the parliament expressly to raise a revenue, though it was admitted, that they were subject to the imposition of such external duties, as might be necessary for the regulation of commerce.

During the long repose[21], which the pacific administrations of France and Great Britain gave to the two countries, from the commencement of the regency of the duke of Orleans and of the ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, the British colonies of America advanced in improvement with unexampled rapidity. Their history is accordingly through this period void of the occurrences, which interest posterity,

[18] Pownall, vol. ii. pp. 65, 66. [19] Ibid., vol. i. pp. 126—129.
[20] Ibid., p. 64. [21] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. p. 381.

nor did any event of this kind diversify their annals, until the year 1759, when the conquest of Canada was effected by the English general Wolfe.

The conquest of Canada was an achievement, the importance of which had long been felt in the colonies. The French in that northern settlement flanked the colonists of Great Britain, and by the habits and addresses of their country were enabled to acquire an ascendency over the savage natives, which was employed in directing their barbarous violences against the neighbouring settlers of the rival nation. So early as in the commencement of the reign of William[22], a ship was despatched to England, to solicit the aid of the mother-country in an enterprise already perceived to be necessary to the security of the colonists. It was however discovered, that the king was too much occupied in Europe for attending to the interests of America, and a determination was therefore formed to attempt the reduction of Canada even without assistance. Various efforts, then and afterwards exerted for this purpose, having failed of success, Canada continued to be regarded as the grand source of the calamities of the northern colonists. The French had in the mean time established a settlement in the southern territory[23], to which they gave the name of Louisiana. As this other colony extended northward, the plan of connecting it with Canada was naturally suggested; and at length the British settlements of America became inclosed within the stations of an active and enterprising enemy, whose communications were facilitated by the great inland navigations of the western continent.

The first effect produced by this relative position was a tendency to union generated among the British settlements, which was manifested in the original formation of a congress. The French appear to have completed their chain of posts in the year 1753[24], and immediately afterwards a

[22] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. p. 257. [23] A settlement was made by the French at New Orleans in the year 1722, which began to flourish about the year 1731. As the colony advanced towards the north, a plan was formed of connecting it with Canada by a chain of forts.—Ibid., p. 430. In 1762-3, the part of Louisiana, which was eastward of the Mississippi, excepting the islands of Orleans, was transferred to England, the remainder to Spain.—Texas by Kennedy, vol. i. p. 216, note. Lond. 1841. [24] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. pp. 436, &c.

convention of delegates[25], assembled for devising means of conciliating some Indian nations, prepared the plan of a permanent representation of the colonies for the superintendence of their common interests. In this primary effort of union we find Benjamin Franklin[26], afterwards so distinguished in the American revolution, the proposer of the plan, which was in the following year submitted to the British government.

This plan was frustrated by the mutual jealousies of the crown and of the colonies, the crown being apprehensive of a concerted resistance directed against the supremacy of the mother-country, and the colonies being alarmed at the influence of a president of the union, who was to derive his appointment from the crown. As no satisfactory plan of union could be devised, it was unavoidable that the colonies should be protected by British troops, assisted by voluntary reinforcements, which the provincial assemblies might supply. The second and principal influence of the relative position of the British and French colonies accordingly was, that the former felt themselves compelled to look to the mother-country for protection in the arduous contest with the rival settlements. This dependence, which the alarming vicinity of the French settlers had at all times rendered sensible, was most sensibly experienced in the final struggle[27], by which the safety of the British colonies was secured.

The conquest of Canada, in removing the apprehension of external hostility, was the signal of that independence, which the American states attained at the expiration of twenty-four years, because it freed them from the necessity of seeking protection. It was from that moment certain[28], that the

[25] From New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode-Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.—Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. p. 439. [26] Pownall, vol. ii. p. 144. [27] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. i. pp. 97, 98. [28] 'When the retention of Canada was first proposed, that able statesman, the duke de Choiseul, declared, that he could not object to a plan, which would necessarily prove so ruinous to the enemies of France: for he wisely foresaw, that our American colonies, when once relieved from the terror of such a neighbour, when once freed from all apprehension of being made subject to the house of Bourbon, would soon begin to consider Great Britain as the only power, of whom they ought to be jealous.'—Sinclair's Hist. of the

British settlements of America must speedily become independent communities; and it only remained to be determined, whether any contingent occurrences should accelerate, or retard, the natural and inevitable operation of political causes. It so happened that events of an accelerating influence were supplied by the circumstances and administration of the British government.

While the successes of the seven-years' war removed those bonds, which had previously retained the British settlements of North America in dependence, its expenses prompted the mother-country to resort to measures, which alarmed the jealousy of the colonists, and disposed them to withdraw themselves from a connexion no longer necessary to their safety. The protection of the colonies having been a principal object of the war, in which these expenses were incurred, the minister determined to seek in the resources of America the means of alleviating the burthens of the nation, and for this purpose procured an act of parliament, imposing together with certain duties of a commercial nature, the celebrated stamp tax. To the commercial duties[29], though in various respects offensive, the colonies might have submitted, having been long accustomed to acquiesce in the exercise of a power of regulating commerce, claimed by the mother-country. But the stamp-tax, obviously introduced for the purpose of raising a revenue by internal taxation, was the very torch of the genius of discord, and enkindled a conflagration never to be extinguished but in the dissolution of all connexion of the colonies with Great Britain.

When the intelligence of this measure arrived in America, the legislatures of several states passed resolutions, protesting against it as a violation both of the British and the American constitutions; and the state of Massachusetts, with the hereditary independence of that republican colony, recommended that a congress should be assembled, a recommendation generally approved and adopted. The colonies however were not then ripe for independence, nor had

Revenue, vol. ii. p. 78. The prediction of the French statesman was fulfilled in regard to the independence of the British colonies, though it failed in regard to the ruinous influence of their separation.

29 Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. ii. p. 105.

they such an object even in contemplation. Franklin himself was of opinion[30], that they were unable to resist the mother-country; and the history of the war, in which this dissension terminated, must satisfy every reader, that the independence of the American states, as it was at that time accomplished, was much more the work of one extraordinary individual, than the result of the resources and vigour of the colonial confederacy. France withheld its assistance, until the strength of America, guided by the wisdom and perseverance of Washington, had been proved on the plain of Saratoga. When indeed the capture of Burgoyne and his army had given the first omen of success, the French government afforded aid, which for a time gave to the American cause a maritime superiority; and the capture of lord Cornwallis completed what had been begun by the former advantage, in baffling the military efforts of Great Britain. Even then however the independence of the colonies may have been immediately decided by the resolution of abstaining from offensive measures[31], adopted by the British house of commons, under the influence of a very powerful opposition, for it has appeared from the papers of Laurens, an American minister at Paris, which were captured near Newfoundland, that the French minister had declared to the American commissioners, that France was then incapable of affording further assistance.

That the independence of the American colonies should have been thus anticipated, must appear a most favourable arrangement to all, who will consider, that ten years only elapsed before the commencement of that great struggle with France, in which the powers of the British government were exerted to their utmost energy, an interval indispensably necessary for recovering it from the shock of so great a dismemberment, and for permitting it to avail itself of that extension of British commerce[32], which, contrary to the pre-

[30] Marshall's Life of Washington, vol. ii. p. 114. [31] Knox's Extra-Official State Papers, pp. 27, 28. Lond., 1789. [32] In the year 1820 it was stated in the house of lords by the marquess of Lansdowne, that in the year preceding the war the goods exported from the British empire to these colonies did not exceed in value three millions, whereas they then amounted to thirty. — Edinb. Annual Register, vol. xiii. p. 90. Talleyrand has remarked, that France discouraged a connexion with America through a fear of the contagion of

vailing expectation, was the result of the independence, and the consequent prosperity of the colonial states. If the revolution of America had not been urged forward, it might have been contemporary to that great convulsion, which many interior causes were then generating in France, and Great Britain, occupied by this domestic struggle, might have been disabled for opposing an effectual resistance to the revolutionary violence of that country. The same anticipation of a revolution, which must at length have been effected in the regular operation of political causes, had also an important operation, in urging forward the great movement, by which the government of France was subverted, as the aid, which it rendered necessary to the success of the Americans, both augmented its financial embarrassments, and sent home a number of military officers, animated with a love of the independence, which they had assisted to establish, and eager to communicate the new feeling to their already discontented countrymen. Both events would probably have soon occurred, though the revolution of America had not been thus anticipated, for the colonies would soon have become too considerable for independence, and the third estate in France could not long continue to submit to the exclusive privileges of the superior classes of society. But to the power and

republican principles. The United States were on the other hand attracted to a commercial connexion with Great Britain by the identity of language, the resemblance of government, the old habits of the leaders of the revolution revived by the practices of France in fomenting division, and, above all, by the interest of commerce. America, he added, had no real exchange except at London.—Mem. sur les Relations Commerc. des Etats Unies avec l'Angleterre, pp. 9—27. The apprehensive jealousy of the French government even gave occasion to the separate peace concluded by the United States with the mother-country, a British cruiser having intercepted a despatch sent home by the French minister at Philadelphia, in reply to a long list of enquiries, relative to the most effectual means of restraining the growth and power of the new republic, which it was feared might deprive France of her West Indian islands.—Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. ii. pp. 603, 604, note. This charge of perfidy is confirmed by the testimony of the French convention, in an address to the United States on the appointment of a minister plenipotentiary. The address states that 'the support, which the ancient French court had afforded the United States to recover their independence, was only the fruit of a base speculation; and their glory offended its ambitious views, and the ambassadors of France bore the criminal orders of stopping the career of their prosperity.—Letters of Pacificus, annexed to the Federalist, vol. ii. p. 326. New York, 1802.

safety of Great Britain it seems to have been necessary, that the American should by some years precede the French revolution; and, when our government had been prepared to engage in the great struggle for the independence of Europe, it was probably salutary to the loyalty of the people, that a longer postponement of this other crisis should not continue to expose them to the contagious influence of revolutionary principles.

The revolution of North America is a memorable epoch in the history of human society. In its origin it is distinguished from all others, as being a contest for a principle, when no experience of actual oppression had goaded to resistance. In its consequences it fills the mind with the variety and the magnitude of its influences. By augmenting the prosperity of the United States, it increased the commerce of the mother-country, the ruin of which had been anticipated as its inevitable result; by the contagious influence of republican habits, even more than by the aggravation of financial embarrassment, it gave the impulse to the revolution, which soon subverted the kingdom of its ally, and eventually destroyed the system of Europe; by its prosperity and its example it has begun a new series of human history, the history of another continent, dating from this epoch its independent policy, and commencing a new system of political relations, which must involve in its combinations all the countries of the other regions of the earth. Great therefore was the importance of the personal character of the man, under whose guidance this revolution was effected. Looking forward with a penetrating eye into the possibilities of a glorious futurity, patiently overcoming the difficulties perpetually encountered in the daring enterprise, steering the frail vessel of his country through all its hazards to a successful termination, Washington appears to have been, in every view, the moral Columbus of the Western world. He led the way to the discovery of a western world of policy, and, like Columbus, he became an example of the ingratitude of his country[33].

[33] A violent party was soon formed in the legislature, which accused him of aiming at royalty; and the monument voted at his death, which occurred in the year 1799, had not been erected, when eight years from that event had expired.—Life of Washington, vol. v. pp. 413, 414, 556, 833.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the history of France, from the commencement of the reign of Louis XV. in the year 1715 *to that of the reign of Louis XVI. in the year* 1774.

Louis XV. king in the year 1715—Law's *system* begun, 1716—destroyed, 1720—The Jesuits suppressed, 1762—The parliaments suppressed, 1771—The philosophers—The economists.

WHILE the federal system of Europe was advancing to its maturity, and then hastening to its dissolution, its central and principal member was gradually yielding to an interior corruption of its government, which must have proved destructive of the general system, even though the combinations of that system had continued to maintain their consistency. A government so important as France could not have experienced a decay of its energies, and then the extraordinary excitement of a democratic revolution resulting from that decay, without causing a general derangement of the existing relation of states. But the system was at the same time verging to its dissolution. By the general combination for the reduction of the power of Great Britain in the war of America, by the disregard of the barrier-treaty in the centre of Europe, and by the partition of Poland in the north, the grand combinations of the system had been loosened and destroyed. The principle of a federative system was abandoned, when the secondary states were induced to combine against that power, to which they should have looked for protection against the predominance of France. The connecting link of the existing system was severed, when the barrier-treaty was violated, by which the maritime states and Austria had been bound together in a common alliance. The very notion of a federative security was exploded from the policy of the governments, when they had begun to combine, not for the mutual protection of their own independence, but for a partition of a territory exposed to their attacks. The great convulsion of the French government consummated the ruin of the system, but it only destroyed that, which had already lost its principles, and was in truth not fitted for a longer existence.

The only question, which in such a case could remain for a political speculator, is whether, without such a convulsion, the decaying system might not have been peaceably regenerated, and so much misery have been spared to the world. To the doubt, which this question would imply, the uniform experience of mankind is opposed, which attests that war, evil and calamitous as it is, has hitherto been the grand spring of human improvement. The construction of a system of federative policy in particular appears to require the operation of this scourge of mankind, as it is the result only of an apprehension of overbearing violence, providing and combining the means of a common resistance. The earlier system of federal policy was accordingly the work of the great war of Germany, which had been waged during thirty years; and its transformation into a larger and more convenient adjustment of political interests was the result of the wars, which occupied the long and splendid reign of Louis XIV. We may therefore reasonably conclude, that a yet wider extension of the system, to comprehend in one common arrangement all the governments of Europe, could not have been a peaceable development of existing principles, but required a great and mortal struggle, in which all the nations of Europe should be engaged, even to their utmost efforts.

The reign of Louis XIV. had accomplished the change of government begun by the administration of cardinal Richelieu. The minister reduced the Protestants and the nobles. The monarch completed the destruction of the former, so far as the violence of persecution could effect it; and, that the government might contain within it no organ of liberty, however imperfect, he at length succeeded in rendering the parliament of the capital an almost passive instrument of his pleasure. Neither had Louis merely triumphed over the nobility in the fulness of his authority, but he degraded it yet more by placing at its head his own illegitimate offspring, whom he caused to be declared capable of succeeding even to the inheritance of the crown. In his long reign moreover a new generation arose, formed to the new principles of the government, and prepared to transmit them to their posterity. France accordingly ap-

[1] Mably, tome iii. pp. 297, 298.

peared at length to have been reduced to the simplicity of a military monarchy, tempered indeed by the moderation of European habits, but destitute of all the resources of civil independence.

Such however is the unceasing revolution of human affairs, that in this very reign, which completed the exaltation of the royal power, were prepared the seeds of that independence, by which it was afterwards overthrown. Eager to enrich the country, the power of which he wielded, Louis permitted Colbert to encourage a spirit of commerce, which necessarily gave importance to the unprivileged classes of his subjects; and desirous of throwing round his throne the brilliancy of literature, he enlightened at the same time the minds of those, by whom the throne was not approached. The nobles were still intrenched within the prescriptive privileges of their rank; but a new aristocracy of commercial acquisition was soon opposed to the aristocracy of ancient inheritance, and, when the general diffusion of information had placed the two classes on the same level of intelligence, the physical force of numbers, aided by the possession of wealth, would necessarily overwhelm the pretensions of titular distinction.

While this monarch raised up a power among the lower classes to contend with the privileged orders and the throne, he undermined his own authority by financial embarrassment. The heavy burden of debt[2], which his wars and his magnificence had imposed upon the government, created a dependence, which baffled the pretension of unlimited power, and even gave to the people a dominion over the state. A public debt is a principle of strength, in attaching individuals to the government, when it is established upon public confidence; but this can only be in a government so constituted, as to admit the people to be managers of their own contributions. In France indeed, during a part of the succeeding reign, there was a great degree of public confidence. It was however a temporary paroxysm of commercial speculation, not a deliberate reliance on the integrity of the government.

[2] The debt of France at this time, according to a statement published by the regent in the year 1720, exceeded 1977 millions of livres, or 82,375,000*l.*—Anderson, vol. iii. p. 357. Dublin, 1790.

The necessity of preserving some organ of communication with the people, for supplying the expenses of the government, had preserved, even during the reign of Louis XIV., the form of registering the edicts of the court in the parliament of Paris, though that body was forbidden to express any opinion, by remonstrating against the order, of which it was made the depository. To this almost empty form was reduced the constitutional influence of the people of France upon the measures of their government. Yet this form, unimportant as it may appear, had in one remarkable instance presented to Louis XIV. an impediment, which all the plenitude of his power was not sufficient to overcome, his last efforts having been unsuccessfully exerted in endeavouring to prevail with the parliament to register the papal bull[3], which the Jesuits had procured for the condemnation of their adversaries the Jansenists.

It is a curious fact, that the stability of this last stay of freedom was in a considerable degree the result of the gross abuse, by which the seats in this assembly of magistrates had become venal. That independence of the judges, which in the British constitution was the offspring of liberty, could in the French government originate only from an abuse, because it was adverse to the spirit of a military monarchy. When the ministers of justice had been allowed to purchase the right of deciding on the claims of their fellow-subjects, their office became a personal property, and the parliament acquired the stability, which must belong to property in every settled government.

Though in the reign of Louis XIV. the political import-

[3] This, which is known by the name of the bull *Unigenitus*, and was issued in the year 1713, declared that the observations of Quesnel on the New Testament, which maintained the Calvinistical doctrine of Jansenius bishop of Ypres, contained one hundred and one heretical propositions, among which was condemned this maxim, that the fear of an unjust excommunication ought never to deter us from doing our duty. St. Simon has accounted for the number, one hundred and one, by remarking that the confessor of the king, a Jesuit, had asserted that the book contained more than a hundred errors, so that the pope found it necessary to exceed that number in his statement.—Mem. of the Affairs of Europe from the Peace of Utrecht by Lord John Russell, vol. i. p. 84. London, 1824. The bull, after a strenuous resistance, was at length accepted by the parliament in the year 1720.

ance of the parliament had been reduced to the form of registration, the situation, in which that prince left the government at his death, was such, that this court was enabled to resume its rank in the state. The successor being but five years old, the government was necessarily committed to a regency. An administration of this form, as it can never exert the whole vigour of the royal authority, is necessarily favourable to the development of the various interests existing in a state, and in almost any circumstances would have permitted the parliament to recover its influence. The actual circumstances were even auxiliary to the efforts of that body, the regent being by them disposed to conciliate its support, and consequently to attribute to it an importance, which might render its support efficacious.

The duke of Orleans, to whom, as the first prince of the royal family, the regency should regularly have been committed, was discredited by his notorious immoralities, and by the imputation of the atrocious guilt of poisoning the dauphin, the dauphiness, and their son, which however appears to have been unfounded[4]. A strong party had on the other hand been formed in favour of one of the illegitimate sons of the late king, who had been recently classed among the acknowledged members of the royal family. The deceased monarch appears to have proposed in his will to regulate the regency in such a manner, as to compromise the claim of the two parties. The duke was nominated the regent, but with a council composed of persons attached to his competitor, to whom was intrusted the person of the young king. Of this will the monarch declared his expectation, that it would be as little regarded after his decease, as that of his father had been at his own accession. The event justified the expectation. The first act of the regent was to appeal to the parliament from the restrictions, which fettered his authority; to induce that body to favour his wishes, he restored to it the right of remonstrating, of which it had been deprived by the preceding king; and it was itself well inclined to support the pretensions of a prince, who could not

[4] It is rejected by lord J. Russell, who remarks that it was countenanced chiefly by this circumstance, that the duke had in his house a laboratory, in which he amused himself with chemical experiments.—Mem. of the Affairs of Europe from the Peace of Utrecht, vol. i. p. 84.

be suspected of a bigoted attachment to its adversaries the Jesuits, and was so indolent, that it might well hope to participate in the administration. The regent was accordingly invested with all the authority of his station, and the parliament was restored to its right of remonstrating concerning the measures, which it should be required to register.

The long reign of Louis XV., a reign of fifty-nine years, is naturally divisible into three periods; the regency of the duke of Orleans, the administration of cardinal Fleury, and the reign of the mistresses. It was in truth a perpetual pupillage, begun with a natural incapacity of a minority, continued by the ascendency acquired by a tutor in the education of a feeble mind, and concluded by the domineering influence of licentious passion[5]. In a favourable crisis of his life he obtained from the affections of his subjects the honourable title of *the well-beloved*[6]. At that time the affairs of his government had been prudently administered by the cautious moderation of Fleury, and one of his earlier mistresses, solicitous for the glory of her lover, had excited him to expose himself to the fatigues and dangers of war. He lived however to change the affectionate anxiety of his people into an impatient expectation of his successor, and the title of *the desired*, bestowed upon that successor, was a severe retraction of his former popularity.

The feeble government of this prince, protracted through more than the half of a century, was the apt prelude to the revolution, which closed the following reign, for it unbent the springs of despotism, so strained by Louis XIV., and suffered the growing energies of the people to expand themselves against the pressure of the privileged orders. It was concluded indeed with a violent exertion of arbitrary power in the suppression of the parliament; but the people had then begun to be sensible of their own importance, and the

[5] This was the effect of artful seduction. When, in the execution of the scheme, one of his courtiers directed his attention to some beautiful female, he coolly answered, I think the queen still more beautiful.—Private Life of Louis XV., vol. ii. p. 22. Dubl., 1781. [6] In the year 1744, when he had recovered from a fever, occasioned partly by the fatigue of a military expedition, partly by habitual intemperance. Lacratelle has remarked, that the nation had, during almost sixteen years of peace, been happy under the government of an economical and pacific minister, and the malady of the king appeared to have been induced by the fatigue of war.—Hist. de France, pendant le dix huitième Siecle, tome ii. pp. 298, 299. Paris, 1812.

suppression of an assembly, which they regarded as their only protection, was but preparatory to its re-establishment with augmented authority.

The internal administration of the regency, besides the restoration to the parliament of the privilege of remonstrating, is distinguished as comprehending the memorable schemes of Law, which excited the activity of the nation, though they involved it in one common bankruptcy. The financial distress of France, at the death of Louis XIV., was so extreme, that it was proposed to the regent, to assemble the states general, and declare the government insolvent. The proposal was rejected by the regent, who feared to compromise his authority, and various expedients were adopted for supplying the deficiency of the public funds. The first of these was to order a recoinage of the circulating coin with a change of its value; the next was a revision of the debts of the state, for distributing it into different classes, to which different rates of payment were to be assigned. The latter was in effect a bankruptcy, especially since a large proportion of the claims was arbitrarily annihilated, as forged, or surreptitiously acquired, or usurious. These were followed by a commission for enquiring into the conduct of the loan-contractors of the preceding reign, and forcing them to disgorge a portion of their gains for the relief of the public. All were however soon found to be insufficient, and the schemes of Law were eagerly encouraged, as alone promising effectual assistance.

This projector began in the year 1716 with the institution of a private bank, the notes of which should be exempt from the depreciation of the coin[7], being payable only in the coin current when they had been issued. In the beginning of the year 1719 this establishment was converted into a royal bank; the payments were no longer guarded against the depreciation of the currency; and, within the first year from the change, the issue of notes was extended from fifty-nine millions of livres to a thousand. Law had in the mean time commenced the formation of a company, for managing commercial concerns in every part of the globe, farming the whole of the revenue of the state, and directing the coinage of the country. The project of this company was called

[7] Lord John Russell, vol. i. pp. 485, &c.

the Mississippi-scheme, because it began with the possession and trade of the province of Louisiana, watered by the great river Mississippi; but it afterwards assumed the title of company of the Indies. In the year 1720 it was incorporated with the royal bank, and *the system*, as the plans of Law were then named, became complete.

The decline of *the system* had already commenced, for many more prudent speculators had begun to apprehend, that it must fail from the very extravagance of its success, and converting their stock into cash, carried it into foreign countries. So great was from this apprehension the apparent scarcity of coin, that, after several edicts had been issued for restricting the payments of the bank, and for varying the standard of the coin, an edict was published in the same month, in which *the system* was completed, prohibiting under the penalty of a large fine and of the confiscation of the sum found, any person from having in his possession more than five hundred livres. Three months afterwards another edict put an end to *the system*, as it ordained that, after a gradual diminution, its securities should at the end of a year pass current for only one-half of their actual value.

Though this extraordinary project must have occasioned much confusion and distress, historians have represented its influence as generally beneficial. The historian of Louis XV.[8], in particular, has compared its operation, in drawing forth the commercial activity of the French people, to that of a civil war in exciting its political and moral energies. All the orders of the state had been for a time engaged in the most eager speculations of pecuniary advantage; and, though many had suffered severely by the failure, yet the nation had disengaged itself from the habits and prejudices of a feudal government, and had become accustomed to contemplate the benefit to be derived from a rapid circulation of property. The East Indian company too, which for a time rivalled those of the Dutch and the British, arose out of the ruins of Law's comprehensive establishment. The general confusion moreover afforded the regent an opportunity of cancelling so considerable a portion of the public debt, increased as it had been by the operations of the projector, that he declared it to be reduced to little more than a sixth

[8] Des Odoards, tome i. p. 317.

part of the sum[9], to which it had amounted at the death of Louis XIV.

The parliament, perhaps instigated by the legitimated princes[10], who were hostile to the regent, was well disposed to interfere with the operations of *the system*. The favour, with which it had been regarded by the public, had rendered the sanction of the parliament unnecessary, and its several modifications had accordingly been established by the mere authority of the government. From the time however, when the bank of Law was declared to be a royal establishment, the parliament never ceased to endeavour to open the eyes of the government, until *the system* was totally ruined. For this interference it was chastised with banishment, nor was it recalled, until the regent deemed it expedient to compromise the dissension on the condition, that it should at length consent to register the long-disputed bull, which the Jesuits had procured for the condemnation of the Jansenists.

Though in this instance the regent became the patron of the Jesuits, the general conduct of his government had been favourable to the contrary party. No one indeed was better fitted to extinguish the controversy by rejecting the pretensions of the Jesuits[11], and in the beginning of his government he had adopted several measures, which seemed to indicate such a determination; but they had contrived to interest in their protection the abbé Dubois[12], who had risen from the condition of an obsequious dependent of the duke to that of his confidential counsellor; and their triumph, which Louis XIV. had been unable to accomplish, was at length effected in a crisis, in which the attention of the public was engrossed by the catastrophe of *the system*. Thus was established the ascendency of that extraordinary and

[9] Instead of which sum of almost two thousand millions, says the statement published by the regent, the king now owes scarcely three hundred and forty millions.—Anderson, vol. iii. p. 357.

[10] Regence du Duc d'Orleans, par Marmontel, tome ii. pp. 35, 162, 174. Paris, 1803. [11] Ibid., pp. 259, &c. Des Odoards, tome i. pp. 298, 299. [12] Des Odoards has assigned also another reason, namely, that the Jesuits had caused the court of Spain to interfere in their behalf, requiring that the government of France should favour their interest, as a condition of the double alliance of the two royal families; of the marriage of Louis XV. with the infanta of Spain and of that of the prince of the Asturias with the daughter of the regent.

important order, which was to be wholly suppressed at the expiration of the brief period of forty-two years. The piety of the Jansenists was forced to yield to the institutions of Rome, though for their peculiar doctrine they pleaded the authority of Augustin.

The regent[13] was disposed to maintain peace with Great Britain, being naturally apprehensive of the competition of the king of Spain, for the regency in the first instance, and then, in the case of the death of the king of France, for the succession to the throne, which was accordingly the main subject of the negotiation carried on in the year 1716.

The regency was terminated in the year 1723; but the three years, which were interposed between its conclusion and the commencement of the administration of cardinal Fleury, may be considered as a continuation of it, not only because, on account of the extreme youth of the king, the duke of Orleans continued for some time to exercise the same authority, but also because nothing materially affecting the interior government occurred in the transitory administration, which followed his death.

The administration of Fleury occupied a much larger portion of this reign, being terminated only by the death of the cardinal, in the year 1743, seventeen years after he had been called to the direction of the state. Of these seventeen years the last two were agitated by the war of the Austrian succession. The others formed a period of undisturbed tranquillity, and with the preceding part of the reign compose an extraordinary example of national repose. Frugality and conciliation were the characteristics of this minister, and they were also the qualities most required in the circumstances of the kingdom. It has been observed too[14], that the duke of Orleans was the fittest of all men to direct the state in the period of the regency, and the cardinal in that which succeeded. The pleasurable indolence of the regent tended to give a spirit of moderation to his ordinary government, while the decision of his character, when he was roused by an important occasion, repressed the violence of the parties, which had broken into action at the conclusion of a long and vigorous reign. The crisis of Law's *system* also demanded the

[13] Lord Mahon's Hist. of England, vol. i. pp. 324, 325, 332.
[14] Private Life of Louis XV., vol. ii. p. 87.

energy of such a minister, but would have overwhelmed the timidity of the cardinal. As that crisis was managed by the duke, it at once excited the commercial activity of the nation, and lightened the incumbrances of the state. Then indeed the orderly economy of the cardinal was most conducive to the public advantage. Credit became re-established, and commerce attained to a prosperity, which in that country it had not before enjoyed. In the very commencement of his ministry he took care to put an end, for a very long time[15], to the variations of the value of the coin by a reasonable adjustment, a measure constituting the surest basis of commercial improvement.

The foreign policy, which the regent had adopted under the influence of personal considerations, the cardinal continued because it was favourable to peace. The extraordinary spectacle was therefore still exhibited, of the two rival governments of France and Great Britain combining to maintain the tranquillity of a system of federative policy, which had been established by the most obstinate efforts of their mutual hostility. The reproach of the administration of Fleury is that he neglected the marine of France, suffering it to sink into a decay, the effects of which were fatally experienced in the succeeding wars[16]. But his neglect of the navy was a part of the policy of preserving peace with Great Britain[17]; and a minister of France might well question the expediency of endeavouring to support a military marine in a country[18], in which foreign commerce was yet cultivated chiefly through imitation.

One important operation of this pacific policy, begun by the regent and long continued by the cardinal, appears to have escaped the observation of the historians, though they could not fail to notice the effect. It has been commonly remarked that the philosophy[19], which has been intimately

[15] This was done in the year 1726, and no further change was introduced until the year 1785.—Des Odoards, tome iii. p. 27.

[16] Ibid., p. 107.

[17] Ibid., tome ii. p. 242.

[18] Ibid., tome iii. p. 111.

[19] The philosophers of France are reducible generally to two classes; the encyclopedists and the economists. The first volume of the Encyclopédie appeared in the year 1751; the economists did not form a sect until the year 1760. While the former attacked religion and the clergy, the latter combated the whole system of the finances of the government. Montesquieu did not belong to either

concerned in the subversion of the French government, first showed itself in France about the middle of the eighteenth century. It is known also that those, who formed the philosophical school of that country, were penetrated with a profound admiration of the liberal policy of the British government, and of the enlarged views of the writers, who thought and wrote under its protection. They did not indeed select the examples most deserving imitation, for the mind of France had been already corrupted by Bayle [20], and the freedom of discussion, enjoyed in Great Britain, had permitted the advocates of irreligion to advance their sophisms amidst the conclusive arguments of sound philosophy. Collins and Bolingbroke [21] were more acceptable to men thus predisposed to infidelity, than Locke and Newton. It is reasonable to believe, that this disposition to emulate, though perversely, the freedom of British speculation, was much favoured among the French by the harmony, which so long subsisted between the two governments. The mere suspension of political rivalry must have facilitated the transmission of opinions from the one country to the other; the habit of co-operating for the maintenance of the general tranquillity would yet more familiarise the restricted minds of the French to the more enlarged modes of thinking prevalent among the British; and the gross abuses of their government, when thus brought into a direct comparison with the British constitution, would urge them to the most eager adoption of that, which seemed to them to be British philosophy. The fashion of admiring everything English had indeed been begun by the regent and his friends [22], before it appeared in the compositions of writers, so that the court itself afforded example

party, but contributed powerfully to propagate a desire of political change, by commending openly, and in the strongest language, the constitution of England. [20] Bayle was born in the year 1647, and died in the year 1706. Bred a Protestant, he was converted to the religion of Rome in a seminary of Jesuits; he then recanted his new faith, and in his dictionary he afterwards inculcated a general scepticism, rendered attractive to licentious minds by indecent anecdotes. [21] Bolingbroke had been inspired with disgust at non-conformity, and perhaps with hatred of christianity, by the compulsory perusal of one hundred and ninety sermons, all of great length, on the 119th Psalm, composed by Manton, a dull Puritan.—Carwithen, vol. iii. p. 43.

[22] Tableau de la Litt. Franc. pendant le dix-huitième Siecle, pp. 40, 41. Paris, 1813

and encouragement to them, who in praising the institutions of England condemned those of their own country. The first of these was Voltaire [23], who writing with genius and vivacity in every species of composition, both in poetry and in prose, established himself in a sort of dictatorship over the literature of France.

The policy of the duke of Orleans and cardinal Fleury appears thus to have begun that excitement of the minds of the French people, which was completed by the war of America. The former introduced among them the freedom of the boldest speculation, the latter gave to their political philosophy a decidedly republican character. As the one encouraged unrestrained enquiry, so the other formed to republicanism a number of military missionaries, and taught the people at home to triumph in the success of their republican allies.

The cardinal died in the fourth year of the war of the Austrian succession, in which he had been reluctantly persuaded to engage, flattering himself however with the hope, that hostilities might be of very short continuance, and that he might thus be soon permitted to return to the tranquil system of administration, which he loved. At the death of his tutor and minister the king emulated the declaration, which his predecessor had made at the decease of cardinal Mazarin, announcing his determination of governing thenceforward for himself. But the feeble character of Louis XV.

[23] An American traveller has thus concluded his account of his visit to Ferney. "I visited this place, so consecrated to the feelings of the French, rather with disgust than with enjoyment. I cannot respect the man, who was at once the professed friend and advocate of liberty, and the flatterer of every tyrant in Europe—the philosopher, who was, too purely intellectual to believe the vulgar truths of christianity, only because he was too grossly sensual to live according to its holy precepts—the poet, who composed the Henriade, and really considered it an epic—the historian, who wrote romances under the name of history—the critic, who reviled our unrivalled Shakspeare, and vilified the glorious effusions of the Italian muse. Ingenuity and wit and fluency, and even eloquence, cannot be denied him; but these are rendered more disgusting than even his defects themselves by the mode in which they were abused, and the manifold mischiefs they have wrought. I felt at Ferney, not as if standing in the temple of genius, but as if I had penetrated into the obscene retreat of an embodied demon."—Griffin's Remains, vol. ii. p. 155.

rendered such an effort wholly impracticable. Far from supporting himself the burden, which the cardinal had so long borne, he soon sunk under the dishonourable influence of a series of mistresses, and for the original springs of the subsequent measures of his government, we are forced to search into the recesses of his private profligacy.

This disgraceful portion of the reign of Louis XV. had an important connexion with the revolution, which occurred in the next. It was the period, in which the spurious philosophy of that country, nurtured under the peaceful administrations of the regent and the cardinal, attained to its maturity, and was prepared for the democratic struggles, which so soon afterwards convulsed and destroyed the government. It was a period also, in which men were taught to look with contempt and disgust on the court, dishonoured as it was by an utter disregard of public decency, and to look to the people for the regeneration of the public morals. The spirit of revolution, thus aroused, was yet more excited by the impositions of an oppressive system of finance; and the last provocation was given by the suppression of the parliaments.

The most remarkable transaction of this period was the suppression of the Jesuits. From the very commencement of the reign of Louis XV. a violent struggle had been maintained between that order, which had been favoured by the preceding monarch, and the parliament, which vigorously resisted the celebrated bull procured by it, as not consistent with the liberties of the Gallican church. The regent, finding it necessary to conciliate the parliament, restored to it the right of presenting its remonstrances, and favoured in various instances its efforts against the Jesuits; but he was afterward induced by a private intrigue to espouse the cause of the order [24]. The general moderation of the cardinal disposed him to reject every extreme measure, and endeavour, though vainly, to calm and reconcile the contending parties, inclining however always to be favourable to the Jesuits.

[24] Dubois, who is represented as having been in his youth a pandar of the duke of Orleans, desired to become a cardinal, which could be accomplished only by the aid of the Jesuits, who could be gained only by procuring for them the favour of the regent.—Regence du duc d'Orleans par Marmontel, tome ii. pp. 262, &c.

In this manner a balanced hostility long subsisted between the ecclesiastical and the political body. During the frenzy of Law's *system* the contest was forgotten, and during the foreign hostilities of the state it was occasionally suspended; but the struggle was speedily renewed after these interruptions, and both parties seemed determined not to yield.

At length an event altogether foreign from the struggle brought the Jesuits within the power of the parliament[25], and so decided the contest. That singular order, which laboured assiduously to connect the interests of this world with those of futurity, conducted a commercial establishment in Martinique. The ravages of war involved this establishment in bankruptcy; its correspondence in France called on the brethren of the order to compensate the losses which they had sustained from the connexion; and, these having refused to consider themselves as liable to the demand, it became the duty of the parliament, as the supreme court of justice, to investigate the constitution of the order, that it might be enabled to decide upon the validity of the claim.

Though the enquiry of the parliament, conducted with the acrimonious vigilance of inveterate hostility, discovered in the constitution of the order an ample sufficiency of objectionable principles to justify its suppression, it would not have been able to effect this measure, if circumstances had not favoured its wishes. An attempt having been made four years before to assassinate the king of Portugal, the Jesuits[26],

[25] Des Odoards, tome vi. pp. 110, &c.

[26] About the middle of the seventeenth century the Jesuits had prevailed with the Spanish court to grant them a territory in Paraguay, in which they should have the uncontrolled management of the natives, that they might prosecute their missions with greater success, engaging on their part to pay a certain capitation-tax in proportion to their flock, and to send a certain number of the inhabitants to the royal works, whenever they should be demanded, and the missions should become populous enough to supply them. Their subjects were said to have at length amounted to three hundred thousand families, furnishing a force of sixty-thousand men well armed.—Account of the European Settlements in America, vol. i. pp. 278—280. The Dominicans, jealous of this establishment, induced the court of Spain to cede to Portugal some districts of the territory; and the Jesuits, to preserve their possessions, had recourse at first to menaces, and afterwards to insurrections.—Lacratelle, tome iv. p. 10. Of forty-seven missions, seven refused to suffer themselves to be transferred.—Account of the European Settlements in America, vol. i. pp. 281, 286.

who had been embroiled with the court about the new government established by them in the centre of South America, were regarded as the authors of the crime, and the expulsion of the order from that kingdom had set in the year 1759 the example of their downfall. The duke de Choiseul also, the French minister, was attached to the opinions of the new sect of philosophers, and therefore well disposed to favour any plan, which was hostile to their most formidable adversaries. The order was accordingly suppressed in France in the year 1762 by a decree of the parliament [27].

The suppression of the order was not confined to these two countries, but was speedily extended to others, even to Italy itself. Spain in the year 1767 imitated the example set by Portugal and France, and the example of Spain was immediately followed in Naples, and afterwards in Parma. In Austria the influence of the Jesuits had begun to decline in the commencement of the century [28], the emperor Leopold I. having become sensible of the deficiency of the education, which he had received from them, and having therefore intrusted to other preceptors the instruction of his children. The empress Maria Theresa suppressed the order there [29], but took care to alleviate as much as possible the sufferings of individuals. The ecclesiastical revolution

[27] The greater part of the parliaments of France immediately issued similar orders, but in some the Jesuits continued to possess influence, and the measure was not completed until the year 1764.

[28] Coxe's Hist. of Austria, vol. i. p. 1155. To the Jesuits, says Mr. Coxe, Leopold I. 'owed the acquisition of multifarious knowledge, and such an intimate acquaintance with theology, jurisprudence, metaphysics, and the speculative sciences, that he was called the most learned prince of his age. When the death of his brother Ferdinand opened a more flattering prospect, he could not throw off his early habits and principles, but still displayed rather the virtues of a recluse, and the acquirements of a professor, than the qualifications of a prince. He was minute in acts of devotion, much addicted to judicial astrology and alchemy, and proud of displaying his knowledge of Latin style. To his preceptors also, like Ferdinand II., he owed the principal defects of his character, and the great embarrassments of his administration: at their instigation he was induced to persecute the Protestants, and to commit those frequent breaches of faith, which diminished the confidence of his subjects, and tarnished the lustre of his reign.'—Ibid., pp. 1154, 1155. Hence we may form a just idea of the sort of education afforded by the Jesuits in the earlier part of the eighteenth century.

[29] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 489.

was completed in the year 1773, when the order was suppressed at Rome by Clement XIV.[30], who was bribed to it by the restitution of Avignon and the Venaissin, which had been taken from the preceding pontiff five years before for his opposition to the measure.

The victory, thus gained by the parliament over the Jesuits in the year 1762, was in truth the victory of the new school of philosophy, which about twenty years before had begun to show itself in France[31]. The Jesuits, anxious to recommend themselves to favour by every expedient, had distinguished themselves by all such attainments in learning, as were compatible with the spirit of their order; but, subjected as that order was to a rigid and arbitrary superintendence, and specially devoted to the maintenance of the supremacy of the Roman see, its constitution was utterly irreconcilable to the unreserved examination of principles, which, however frequently abused, is yet the characteristic of genuine philosophy. The abolition of the order at this particular crisis was therefore an event the most favourable to the indulgence of the new spirit of unrestrained discussion. While it destroyed that extensive and powerful influence, which had already begun to be employed in repressing the investigations of the philosophers[32], it gave to the rival party the confidence and the animation of triumph. The order was indeed suppressed in favour of a spurious and mischievous school of philosophy; but the world could not otherwise have witnessed that practical illustration of the tenets of the latter, which alone perhaps could lead mankind back to the genuine principles of human duty.

The administration of the duke de Choiseul, which lasted about eight years, was an auspicious period for the progress of the French philosophy[33]. In that interval in particular was matured the sect of the economists, which had its be-

[30] Hist. de France pendant le dixhuitieme Siecle, par Lacratelle, tome iv. p. 307. Clement was prejudiced against the Jesuits, having belonged to the order of the Cordeliers, long their disdained adversaries.—Ibid. [31] Mem. Hist. et Polit. du Regne de Louis XVI., par Soulavie, tome i. p. 41. Paris, 1801. [32] The Jesuits procured the first and second volume of the Encyclopedie to be suppressed by an order of the council.—Des Odoards, tome v. p. 58.

[33] Soulavie, tome i. pp. 89—92.

ginning about two years before the duke was called to the direction of affairs. That beginning too has been traced to the same place, from which the duke derived much of his authority, the chamber of madame de Pompadour, the mistress of the king. M. Quesnay, the physician of the marchioness, was its founder. With his conversation Louis XV. was so much gratified, that he called him his *thinker*, and, when he ennobled him, gave him for his arms three *pansies* in allusion to this appellation.

While this celebrated sect produced the immediate advantage of creating a fashion favourable to agricultural occupations[34], it tended with an inevitable agency to shake the last support of the feudal monarchy of France, and to hasten its ruin. It was not indeed unfriendly to the power of the crown, for the economists on the contrary protested against all limitations of that power[35], as inconsistent with 'the unity of legislation;' but maintaining, as their grand principle, that all real wealth is the produce of the earth, on which therefore all taxes should be directly imposed, they necessarily were opposed to exemptions of the privileged orders, which withdrew from their favourite tax a large portion of the soil of their country.

It was natural that the success, with which the parliament had triumphed over its adversaries the Jesuits, should inspire it with a boldness very unsuitable to its position in the government, and that this spirit should be communicated to the assemblies of the same kind existing in the provinces. A general fermentation accordingly began to agitate all the parliaments of France[36]. To enable themselves to act with greater vigour, the provincial parliaments

[34] Des Odoards, tome vi. pp. 238, 246. [35] 'On the one hand, the evidence of this system appeared to its partisans so complete and irresistible, that they flattered themselves, monarchs would soon see, with an intuitive conviction, the identity of their own interests with those of the nations they are called to govern; and, on the other hand, they contended that it is only under the strong and steady government of hereditary princes, undistracted by the prejudices and local interests, which warp the deliberations of popular assemblies, that a gradual and systematical approach can be made to the perfection of law and policy.' Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, by D. Stewart, p. 263, note. London, 1811. [36] Des Odoards, tome vi. pp. 308, 309; tome vii. pp. 126, 127.

associated themselves under the superintendence of the parliament of the capital. The associated parliaments then proceeded to interfere with all the measures of the government, so that it became evident, that some decisive struggle must either establish the power of the crown on their ruin, or exalt them above the power and control of the crown. By this contest of privilege and prerogative much of the latter years of Louis XV. was rendered a period of anarchy which was terminated only by the suppression of the parliaments. As one minister, supported by one mistress, had suppressed the Jesuits, so another, protected by another mistress, suppressed the antagonists of the order, the parliaments of France.

The duke d'Aiguillon had been governor of Brittany, a province distinguished by a lofty spirit of independence[37], and had there protected the Jesuits[38], who had sought an asylum in a country, in which it was not difficult to find a party ready to engage in any public struggle. The parliament of Brittany, being hostile to the Jesuits, attacked the governor their protector, charging him with embezzlement of the public funds. The parliament of Paris supported the parliament of Brittany, in the prosecution of the obnoxious governor; the king, urged by his mistress, espoused the cause of the governor against their united representations; and the final issue of the struggle was that, in the year 1771, the duke de Choiseul was superseded in the ministry by the duke d'Aiguillon, and that the parliaments were suppressed.

By this suppression of the parliaments an end was put to every semblance of liberty in the government of France. The ministry of the duke d'Aiguillon, which occupied the three years preceding the death of Louis XV., was accordingly a period of unlimited authority. The success of the parliaments would however have only established the power

[37] The states of Brittany in their letter to the king used these remarkable expressions: nous avons la propriété de notre honneur, de notre viè, et de notre liberté, comme vous avez la propriété de votre couronne; nous verserions notre sang pour vous conserver vos droits, mais conservez nous les nôtres . . . il ne s'agit pas ici de simples privilèges . . . . c'est dans le droit naturel, que nous trouvons aujourd'hui celui qui fait l'objet de notre réclamation.—Des Odoards, tome vii. pp. 91, 92.

[38] Soulavie, tome i. pp. 62, &c.

of an oligarchy of magistrates, who had derived their independence solely from the practice of purchasing their places, without any intermixture, or pretence, of popular election. The temporary suppression of these bodies on the other hand made preparation for a very different result, both as it threw the magistrates upon the people for support, and as it postponed their re-establishment until other agencies had generated an agitation so universal, that the parliaments, instead of being merely assemblies of refractory magistrates, became organs of a public sentiment.

The last five years of this reign contributed to accelerate the approaching crisis by the financial operations of the abbe Terray, which have rendered the name of that minister opprobrious. Such was the oppression of his measures, that his enemies attributed to them the frequency of suicide[39], which had been unusual in France. During five successive years the profusion of a profligate court was supplied by the ability of an unprincipled financier; the public burdens, which under the regency had been considerably alleviated, were accordingly at this time increased to the utmost endurance of the nation; and the heavy pressure of multiplied taxation rendered the mass of the people dissatisfied with the government, and ready for adopting with eagerness any new and plausible scheme of reformation.

The personal profligacy of the sovereign, audacious and unrestrained, completed the disorganizing operations of this truly revolutionary reign. The pompous licentiousness of Louis XIV. had given the first great shock to the decency of the public manners; the vulgar libertinism of the regent had spread the contagion of immorality more widely among the courtiers; and the extreme debauchery, into which Louis XV. gradually sunk, perfected the foul work of corruption, and announced the subversion of the monarchy. If the madness of jacobinism exalted a prostitute upon an altar, to receive the veneration of the infatuated partisans of revolution, it should be remembered that the debauchery of a monarch had previously raised one from the lowest haunts of infamy almost to the throne, and that the distinguished orders of the state had, by the baseness of their

[39] In the year 1771 two hundred instances were computed.—Mem. de l'Abbe Terray, tome i. p. 160.

adulation, given their approving sanction to the insult thus publicly offered to virtue and decorum.

CHAPTER X.

Of the history of France, from the commencement of the reign of Louis XVI. in the year 1774 *to the meeting of the states general in the year* 1789.

Louis XVI. king, and the parliament restored, in the year 1774—France assists the revolted colonies of Great Britain, 1778—The notables assembled, 1787—The states general assembled, 1789.

THE revolution of France is a subject, which has already exercised the most vigorous minds, and has excited and exhausted the most vehement and the most opposite feelings. It was a great crisis, not of France only, but of Europe; not of Europe only, but of the world; not of this single age alone, but probably of the entire history of the human species. Future ages will probably regard it as the epoch, from which their modern historians should commence their narrations, as ours have begun their narratives from the subversion of the ancient empire of Rome. It has accordingly been contemplated until the mind has been fatigued even with its greatness, and seeks some new object of its meditations.

Much however and ably as it has been discussed, it still remains to consider it in its connexion with the entire range of the modern history of Europe. Perhaps indeed it is only in this view, that it can be at all adequately considered. The revolutionary crisis of France is not an episode of general history, which may be separated from the main action, and regarded as a detached subject of contemplation. It was the catastrophe of a government, from which the modern system of Europe had originally emanated, and which was, in the later and more perfect arrangement of the system, the central object of its combinations. The dissolution of such a government must have been an event in-

volving all the tendencies of a long series of ages, and affecting all the relations of the entire federative system.

The French revolution has been characterised by its most faithful observer[1], as a revolution without a leader. It was not the work of any of those powerful and daring minds, which turn at their will the fortunes of a nation. However it may have been influenced by the particularities of individual agents, it was in its main operation the spontaneous decomposition of a government, which had lost its principles. It was doubtless accelerated by the weakness, and even by the patriotism, of the monarch, who was crushed by its violence; but the long series of ferocious and bloody anarchy, by which the first convulsion was followed, seems to prove unequivocally that the social stamina of the nation had been destroyed, that no principle of political or moral vigour continued to actuate its combinations, and that the dissolution of the government, which was actually accelerated by contingencies, could not have been long postponed.

The reign of Louis XVI. may more properly be considered as beginning, than as preparing the revolution. Though therefore the year 1789, in which the states general were assembled, has been marked by the immediate crisis of the government, the fifteen years, during which that monarch had feebly struggled with the difficulties of the state, were its expiring agony: and even the war of America, in which it seemed to triumph over the humiliation of Great Britain, was but a convulsive effort, which hastened its dissolution.

At the death of Louis XV. the government of France had become a simple despotism. The parliaments, which, in the absence of every other, had constituted themselves some sort of organ of the public opinion, and assumed a semblance of control over the measures of the crown, had then been suppressed: and in their place had been substituted other bodies, dependent on the crown, and strictly limited to their judicial function, and to that of registering the royal edicts.

1 Annals of the French Revol. by Bertrand de Moleville, vol. i. introd. pp. x, &c. London, 1800. The count de Puissaye contended, that in the first years of the revolution there was not such a combination, as deserved the name of a party. The faction of the duke of Orleans he regarded merely as an *impure product*, proving the state of dissolution, into which the government had fallen.—Memoires, tome i. p. 239. Lond., 1803.

While the royal authority appeared to be thus firmly established, it was in truth undermined by various causes, and tottering on the brink of revolution. The opposition of the parliaments had been quelled; but a public opinion had been formed, which would nor rest satisfied without possessing some organ, by which it might influence the measures of the government. The crown exercised without resistance the power of imposing taxes; but it was already laden with a burden of debt, which embarrassed all its operations of finance, and rendered it inevitably dependent. Nor was the weakness of the government confined to the royal authority, for the nobles were destitute of power, and the clergy of influence.

The original basis of the government, a feudal nobility, had been ruined by a long series of operations, begun so early as in the fifteenth century. Louis XI. commenced the humiliation of the nobles; cardinal Richelieu put an end to their independence; Louis XIV. drew them to his court, and transformed them into courtiers. A great number indeed of noble families remained in the provinces, remote from the seductions of the monarch; but the result, instead of maintaining the ancient importance of the order, was only a separation of it into two adverse, and even hostile classes, the nobles of the court and of the provinces. While this division weakened the order, it was debased by the prodigality, with which patents of nobility were granted[2]; still more by exposing it to sale. Sometimes nobility was openly purchased for a specified sum of money; at other times it was deemed more decent to attach it to the possession of some office, often merely nominal; and, to adapt the bargain to different classes of purchasers, the nobility attached to these offices, was sometimes merely personal, sometimes hereditary, sometimes to become hereditary, when the office should have been discharged a certain number of years, sometimes when it should have been exercised during several generations. The excessive multiplication of these new appointments produced new divisions; those of the noble and

[2] Necker thought that at this time nearly the half of the nobility was composed of families ennobled within two centuries by the acquisition of various offices, a mode of obtaining nobility introduced by cardinal Mazarin in the year 1644.—De la Révol. Franc., tome i. pp. 122, 123. Paris, 1797. He might have said within a hundred and thirty years.

the ennobled, the nobility of the sword, of office, and of the law, but, above all, that of the ancient and true nobility. This last distinction, strange as it may seem, the government undertook to abolish by an exercise of prerogative. Dispensations were granted to those, who could not produce the qualifications required for the honours of the court; and these persons accordingly became possessed of the privileges of ancient nobility *by order*.

The count de Puissaye, from whose 'Memoirs[3]' these observations have been taken, concludes them with remarking, that the system of equality had made its first essay of confusion on the nobility. Sunk from its aristocratical pretensions to the petty intrigues of a court, divided into a variety of parties mutually opposed, and degraded in the public estimation by the lavish venality, with which its privileges were bestowed, it retained nothing of its original character except some portion of military honour[4], and was fitted rather to furnish partisans for a popular revolution, than to support against one the authority of the crown. Those nobles, who still cherished the ancient ideas of their rank, wished for a change, by which, as they hoped, that rank, might be again established; those who languished in the provinces, wished to overthrow the courtiers, who stood between them and the favour of their sovereign.

From the time when Louis XIV., in the superstition of his declining years, had abandoned himself to the Jesuits, the rulers of the Gallican church, forgetful of its boasted liberties, maintained against the Jansenists a miserable contention about a matter acknowledged to be no fundamental article of their religion, and indeed ridiculous to the common reason of the dispassionate, the question whether the papal infallibility should be admitted as a sufficient proof, that certain obnoxious doctrines were actually inculcated in a particular book, composed early in the preceding century by a bishop of the Netherlands. In this contest the credit of the hierarchy was irretrievably impaired, while the humble piety of the Jansenists[5] assisted the rising party of the philosophers, who were equally inimical to both.

[3] Tome i. pp. 30—42. [4] Essais Histor. sur les Causes et les Effets de la Revol. de France par Beaulieu, tome i. pp. 29, 30. Paris, 1801. [5] Pascal was a sort of middle term between the Jansenists and the philosophers, the lowering conception of human nature, which

The higher clergy were early sensible of the danger, with which they were threatened by the new school of philosophy, and accordingly in the year 1765 had importunately solicited the government[6], to repress by acts of power the alarming inroads of infidelity. They did not however, by their exhortations and their examples, erect in the hearts of the laity the true bulwarks against a spurious philosophy. That they did not maintain a conviction of their faith in the minds of the educated classes is unquestionable, for the attendance of the public worship was generally resigned to the inferior classes of the people[7]. The only remaining vestige of its former consideration was that, except among some more daring spirits, various little artifices were still employed for concealing the neglect. The contempt of religion was however at length carried so far[8], that it became as ridiculous to speak ill of it and its ministers, as to speak favourably of them.

The third estate, or the order of the commons, was even more considerably transformed from the character, which suited the constitution of the government. In the contemplation of the constitution the third estate was composed only of dependent vassals, unworthy of enjoying its rights, and incapable of influencing its measures. That order notwithstanding comprehended in fact among its numbers a large portion of the talent, and no inconsiderable share of the opulence of the nation, the same monarch, who had completed the degradation of the nobles, having also prepared the aggrandisement of the commons of France. The measures of Colbert had excited a spirit of commercial activity, not congenial to the military character of the nobles, but well adapted to their inferiors of the third estate, whom it accordingly actuated and enriched. The ostentatious patronage of the king had at the same time excited another spirit of intellectual activity, which would not be confined

he inculcated in a pious humility, having been adopted by Voltaire in a spirit of debasing philosophy, and the objections urged against human reason by Pascal, for the purpose of exalting revelation, being employed to establish a system of scepticism. An edition of Les Pensees de Pascal, with notes by Voltaire, was accordingly published in London in the year 1785. [6] Soulavie, tome i. pp. 214—225.

[7] Ibid., pp. 207, 208. [8] Mem. du Compte Joseph Puissaye, tome i. p. 58. Lond., 1803.

within the limits of a privileged order, but diffused its influences more especially among the middle classes of the nation. The nobles too generally disdained that knowledge[9], which had no relation to the military art, and regarded as unworthy of their pretensions the employments of the civil government, of the judicature, and of the church also in its inferior stations. The study of the sciences and the exercise of the liberal arts were accordingly resigned to the third estate. Persons of this class filled the universities and the academies; they discharged the functions of the civil administration, and of the distribution of justice; they were the practitioners of the several professions, and the conductors of manufactures. The third estate had thus become possessed of all the situations, which could bestow an influence on the mass of the people, and therefore comprehended within itself the whole moral power of the government.

This estate, which, in the altered circumstances of the nation, had been rendered thus influential, was also the order of persons, which must have been most sensibly affected by the example of the political importance and security, which the various classes of subjects were seen to enjoy under the neighbouring government of Great Britain. The nobles and superior clergy might see in their exclusive privileges some kind of compensation for their own exclusion from all political and civil rights, but the commons could discover only a glaring and mortifying contrast to their depressed condition. Comparatively enriched by commerce, tutored in a spurious and extravagant philosophy, animated by the near and familiar example of a free people, and yet repressed by a government unconscious of their power, the commons of France were prepared to avail themselves of any emergency, which should throw that government upon the popular support.

In such a nation, the crown burdened with an overwhelming debt, and destitute of any organ communicating with the people, the nobility degraded by the operations of the court, and divided into factions, the clergy inefficient themselves, and everywhere encountered by the Jansenists, or by infidels, the commons swollen into a disproportioned importance, and impatient of the restrictions of their actual condition, the sovereignty devolved to a prince, anxious indeed to extricate

[9] De Puissaye, tome i. pp. 34, 35, 46, 47.

the nation from its difficulties, but utterly destitute of the mental vigour, which alone could guide it through embarrassments so numerous, and so perplexing.

The duke de Choiseul, the enemy of Louis XVI., had already described him as a prince[10], whose ridiculous imbecility would naturally tend to cause such a declension of the government, as would dethrone the reigning family. Necker has with more justice represented him as one[11], who was endowed with all the qualities required for a government balanced like our own, which would have relieved him from a burdensome responsibility, and supported him in his well directed wishes. In his actual situation he manifested a patriotism of intention, which encouraged innovation, with a feebleness of will[12], which, rendering him the mere agent of the counsels of his family, excited and irritated the people. If the patriotism of Louis had been supported by mental firmness, he might perhaps have so modified the revolution, as to have averted the ruin of himself and his family; but he had no sufficient materials for forming a constitution like that of Great Britain, much less could he have re-established the ruined system of the federative policy of Europe. If he had been, as the duke de Choiseul described his predecessor[13], at least firm to do ill, he might perhaps have averted for a time, though surely he could not wholly have precluded, the impending calamities. Desirous, as he was, of doing good, and yet unable to maintain his determinations against the opposition, which they encountered, he alternately encouraged and offended the hopes of an agitated people.

It was the grand topic of the invective of Mr. Burke, that the people of France, when they might have adopted the *time-honoured* constitution of the British government, chose rather to indulge their metaphysic subtlety in devising theoretical constitutions, which were mere experiments in policy. Sir James Mackintosh, the ablest of his antagonists, contended on the other hand, that the circumstances of France

10 Soulavie, tome i. p. 95. 11 Necker de la Revol. Franc., tome ii. pp. 35, 36. Paris, 1797. 12 This had been increased, if not created, by an injudicious education, in which he had been too much taught to feel the superiority of his elder brother the duke of Burgundy, who has been represented as of a truly premature intellect. —Mem. de Marmontel, tome iii. p. 275. London, 1805.

13 Soulavie, tome i. p. 94.

rendered such an imitation impracticable; and the vain attempts, which have been made within the last fifteen years, to assimilate the government to that of Great Britain, have justified his reply. Necker, it appears[14], was ardently desirous of effecting such a change, conceiving it to be practicable before the people had been inflamed by success, but was forced to relinquish the plan by the decided antipathy, which the king entertained for the usages of Great Britain. This repugnance indeed he soon saw reason for suppressing; but the moment[15], in which the minister conceived the scheme to be practicable, had been suffered to pass, and it was abandoned.

The circumstances attending the formation of the first ministry of Louis XVI. deserve consideration, as that ministry exercised an important influence in preparing the revolution. Louis appears to have been deeply impressed with the antipathy, which his father, the deceased dauphin, had entertained against the duke de Choiseul, the leader of the Austrian party in the government. This antipathy[16], aided by a written recommendation left by that prince, was employed to determine the nomination of the chief minister; and the nomination fell upon the count de Maurepas, who, when he had been thirty years a minister, had then been exiled by that party twenty-five years before the accession of Louis XVI. The new minister, who united the inconsiderateness of youth with the irresolution of age, was of all men the least qualified for supplying the energy, the deficiency of which so fatally characterised the sovereign. He accordingly abandoned the helm of government to the course of events, contenting himself with guarding his own power against any immediate mischance. The light indifference of his temper at the same time afforded the most favourable opportunity for the operations of the encyclopedists and the economists, who therefore without any interruption proceeded to effect an intellectual, which was soon followed by a political revolution.

The first measure of this minister indeed was sufficiently

[14] Necker, tome i. pp. 131, 132. [15] The particular time, which he has specified, as that in which this change would have been most acceptable to the nation, was that in which the *Cour Pleniére* was projected, or the year 1788.—Ibid., pp. 132, 133. [16] Soulavie, tome ii. p. 143.

bold and decisive; but even this unwonted energy arose from the little personal considerations, by which he was wholly influenced. He restored the parliaments, which three years before had been suppressed by the late king. Desirous of exercising his ministry in tranquillity[17], he was disposed to yield to the clamour, which assailed the new government in favour of those ancient judicatures; jealous of the ascendency of the chancellor, who had suggested their suppression, he wished to shake his authority by undoing his work; and irritated by the exile, in which he had long languished, he felt also a vindictive gratification in annulling the principal operation of the preceding reign. By this measure was restored to authority a body of men proud of its former importance, offended by its recent disgrace, and encouraged by the popularity, which had solicited its re-establishment.

For facilitating this measure[18] it had been necessary to make some changes in the ministry, among which the abbe Terray, opprobriously distinguished as the financier of the latter part of the preceding reign, was succeeded by Turgot, the philosophic leader of the economists, who was recommended by being an adversary to the Austrian party[19], and a friend to the restoration of the parliaments. The public opinion pointed out the reforming spirit of Turgot, as necessary for correcting the manifold abuses of the government; and the count de Maurepas, willing to be popular, took without hesitation, as the associate of his power, a man so strongly supported by the approbation of the people.

Turgot was a favourable specimen of the philosophy prevalent in France. Unimpeachably strict in his morals, he however disbelieved Christianity, and was an enemy to the established clergy of the state[20]. Sincerely desirous of promoting the happiness of the people, he was yet willing to hazard all the inconveniences and calamities, which must attend considerable and abrupt alterations[21]. In his zeal

[17] Soulavie, tome ii. pp. 154, 155. [18] Ibid., p. 197. [19] Ibid., tome iii. p. 131. [20] His enemies accused him of atheism. Even his eulogist described him as a man desirous of separating morality from religion.—Ibid., p. 162.—Vie de Turgot, p. 178. Lond., 1786.

[21] Comment pouvez-vous me faire ce reproche, said he to one of his friends: vous connoissez les besoins du peuple, et vous savez que dans ma famille on meurt de la goutte á cinquante ans.—Vie de Turgot, p. 185.

for the most unlimited freedom of opinion, he was himself violent and unaccommodating[22]. He had contributed several articles to the famous Encyclopédie[23], and he was devoted to the financial principles of the economists.

The integrity and the benevolence of the philosophic financier were at first captivating to the honest patriotism of the sovereign, who is said to have remarked[24], that he found none, who loved the people, except himself and Turgot. Soon however the boldness of his projects[25], which went the length of convening, without delay or preparation, a national assembly representing all proprietors without distinction of orders, alarmed the timidity of the king, as his influence had already excited the jealousy of the minister[26], and he was dismissed from his office at the expiration of twenty months from the time of his appointment. This period, short as it was, exercised an important influence upon the government. The official advancement of a philosopher could not fail to bring to maturity those principles of political change, which had been developed in the long reign of the preceding monarch. It also served to separate the public opinion from the parliament, that body having resisted some of the measures of Turgot, which tended to favour the lower at the expense of the superior classes[27].

Four years of the reign of Louis XVI. were thus employed in affording encouragement to the restless spirit of innovation, which had begun to actuate the people. That

[22] Even doctor Price complained to him of his want of address.—Vie de Turgot, p. 188. It was his maxim, that the honest alone knew how to hate irreconcilably.—Ibid., p. 288. [23] Their subjects were *etymology*, *expansibility*, *existence*, *fair* and *foundation*. In those of *fair* and *foundation* he inculcated the doctrines of the economists and speculative reformers.—Ibid., pp. 20, &c. He is also said to have been the author of the verse composed for a portrait of Franklin; Eripuit cœlo fulmen, mox sceptra tyrannis.—Ibid., p. 200. [24] Ibid., p. 123.

[25] Soulavie, tome iii. pp. 130, 145, 152, 155. In the Memoirs of Louis XVIII., by himself (Lond., 1832) the hostility of the queen, with whose request of some advances of money he had hesitated to comply, is represented as the chief cause of his early removal.—Vol. ii. p. 21.

[26] Ibid., p. 80. [27] 1. The suppression of a tax on grain; 2. a diminution of the tax on tallow; 3. the suppression of duties at the ports; 4. the suppression of wardenships and freedom of companies of tradesmen; and 5. the suppression of services named *corvées* with the substitution of an impost.—Ibid., pp. 85, 86.

people was then, with a policy even more directly ruinous, introduced to a participation in the revolutionary struggle of America, as if it had been feared, that there were not already among them sufficiently active principles of a destructive explosion, and it had been deemed necessary to prepare a train, and to apply the match. The king indeed appears to have been averse from this most unwise[28], as well as unprovoked interference, in the domestic contentions of the rival state; but the ministry[29], jealous of the prosperity of Great Britain, apprehensive of her increasing power furnished by an extended commerce, and still indignant at the humiliating treaty, which had concluded the seven-years' war, was eager to take advantage of the embarrassment occasioned by the discontent of the British colonies, and it was the character of the sovereign to yield to the suggestions of those, by whom he was surrounded.

The glory, with which the British government had concluded the seven-years' war, had impressed the people of France with so great a reverence of the British name, that they were disposed to regard their neighbours as a nation of philosophers, especially since Montesquieu had eulogised their government, as the only one which had liberty for its object. In this state of the public mind, when the discussions of the British parliament had begun to familiarise the people of France to the consideration of political topics, it was probably impossible that a military monarchy, with a very numerous and greatly privileged nobility, should have long continued to exist. But the most ardent friend of revolution could not have suggested any measure more fitted to accelerate the crisis, than that of allying such a government with a republican insurrection. The result may be distinctly traced in the convulsions, which speedily followed, the greater number of those nobles[30], who in the year 1789 attached themselves to the commons of France, in opposition

[28] Soulavie, pp. 344, &c. [29] Soulavie has stated, that M. de Vergennes was determined in favour of a war by a speech of the earl of Chatham, in which he had advised, that the British government should make peace with America, and unite all its force against France.—Ibid., p. 392. [30] Fayette, D'Estaing, Rochambeau, Beauharnois, Lausun (Biron), Custines, Noailles, the two Lameths, Gouvion, Matthieu Dumas, and Berthier.—Soulavie, tome iii. p. 411.

to the king and the nobility, having been officers among the auxiliaries sent to assist the British colonies.

Before the commencement of this war the care of the finances of France had, soon after the dismissal of Turgot, been committed to Necker. Turgot, engrossed by speculative reforms, had in a time of profound peace left the revenue inferior to the expenditure by twenty millions of livres, or more than eight hundred thousand pounds of British money. In the few months, which intervened between his dismissal and the appointment of Necker, the deficiency had even amounted to a million of British pounds [31], and it was evident that the experience and ability of the latter were indispensable to the disengagement of the government. Practically conversant in business, as he had been a banker at Geneva, he found resources so considerable in the simplification of the receipts, and in the suppression of abuses, that the deficiency of the treasury was speedily converted into a redundancy. He was soon indeed obliged to provide for the extraordinary expenses of a war, and was on that account compelled to have recourse to loans; but he contrived by his economy to provide for the payment of the annual debts, which they imposed, and to maintain the credit of the government.

Necker had been recommended to notice partly by the opposition [32], which he had given to the measures of Turgot. Both were reformers, but of very different classes. Turgot, bred in the school of the philosophers, was devoted to the accomplishment of speculative plans, the principle of which was his favourite persuasion of the perfectibility of man. Necker, trained in the practice of mercantile business, was fond indeed of the sentimental refinement of the philosophers, but looked to political reformation chiefly, if not exclusively, as a necessary expedient for the due administration of financial arrangements. Though writing in the language of the philosophers, and dividing their admiration with Turgot, he was much more a banker than a philosopher, and appears to have esteemed the balanced government of these countries, only as on the one hand it conciliated the confidence of the people, and on the other it protected the minis-

[31] Mem. de Marmontel, tome iii. p. 293. [32] Soulavie, tome iv. p. 16.

ter against the importunity of the court. He has been accused of a passion for republican innovation, but seems to have thought only of disengaging the finances. To this purpose his philosophy was auxiliary, as it created an affinity between him and the leaders of the public opinion, which conciliated the public confidence.

It is certain that the method of conducting the financial business of the government, which was introduced by Necker, was at variance with the principle of the government. In all his proceedings he recognised the authority of a public opinion, which he was solicitous to satisfy; and the famous account of the finances, which he delivered to the public, was a distinct acknowledgment of the right of the nation to inspect, and to judge of the expenditure of the state. This measure in particular has been censured, as giving a beginning to revolution. A military government however, which would adhere to its principle, should accumulate a treasure, instead of contracting a debt. The standing policy of Prussia accordingly was to make provision for the expenses of war by the savings of peace. When France chose to adopt the funding policy of commercial government, she created the necessity of that confidence, which cannot subsist without the right of inquiry and control; and the *compte rendu* of Necker, if it was a measure of revolution, grew necessarily out of the practice of a funding government.

Necker was dismissed from the management of the finances in the year 1781. Maurepas, jealous of Necker, as before of Turgot, laboured to alienate the king from him, as from his predecessor, and among the numbers interested in maintaining the abuses, which Necker had proscribed, he easily found persons to assist him in the intrigue. The death of the count, who died about six months afterwards, constituted an epoch of some importance in the history of this interesting reign, for indolent and incapable as he was, he excluded from influence the Austrian party of the court. It is therefore from his death, that the ascendency of the queen over the counsels of the king must be regarded as having commenced. The reign of Louis XVI. is accordingly distinguishable into two equal periods, characterised by the most opposite principles. In that which preceded

the death of the count de Maurepas, the government was so exercised, as to favour the development of those popular principles of policy, which had already struck a deep root, but had not yet unfolded their wide-spreading and overpowering influence. The suppressed parliaments were restored their functions; the new philosophy was even received into the ministry in the person of Turgot; the youth of France was sent to contend in America for the rights of republicans and the duty of insurrection; and the public opinion was solicited to pronounce its judgment concerning the financial measures of the administration. The latter half was of a contrary character, as if it had been designed to provoke to resistance that spirit, which had previously been the object of this manifold encouragement.

Maria Antonietta, it must be acknowledged, was at her introduction into the court of France placed in circumstances of considerable difficulty. Regarded with suspicion by the aunts and sisters of the king, who were adverse to the Austrian connexion, she could not easily have chosen a line of conduct, in which she would have been exempted from censure. The unthinking levity of her character was however very far from suggesting the circumspection, which the difficulty of her situation demanded. Having by an imprudent disregard of ceremony offended the distinguished persons, who constituted her court, she appears to have gradually sunk into a society of obscure and unprincipled adventurers, disgraceful to her reputation, and at length mischievous to the state. During the life of the count de Maurepas this faction[33], which was known as the party of madame de Polignac, was controlled and baffled by his influence. After the death of that minister the king was delivered over to its machinations.

The result of this change of system was seen in the advancement of M. de Calonne to the direction of the finances, a man in every particular contrasted to Necker. Instead of the simple manners and philosophical habits of the Genevese financier, he was characterised by the specious elegancies and the flattering compliances of the minister of a court-party. By no means destitute of the ability, which his

[33] Sur la Cause des Malheurs de l'Europe par M. de L'Isle, pp. 18, &c. Soulavie, tome vi. pp. 27, &c.

station required, he provided in abundance the funds necessary for the administration; but, far from regarding economy as one of the virtues of his office, he even dared to maintain[34], that a profuse expenditure, by animating the general circulation, was the true principle of public credit. He has been described by his rival as the hero of courtiers[35], rather than the minister of a king. We may apply to his administration the beautiful simile of a living poet, who has compared the transitory nature of mortal enjoyment to the smoothness of the torrent[36], just before it is precipitated from the height. The king, says Marmontel[37], was tranquil and all the world was content, when, at the close of three years and a few months of this joyous and brilliant administration, was revealed the fatal secret of the ruin of the state. The annual deficiency of the revenue was found to be one hundred millions of French, or more than four of British money.

In this embarrassing situation the prodigal minister of the court found it necessary to recommend an appeal to the public opinion, proposing to convene an assembly of *notables*, or of considerable persons of the several orders, selected by the sovereign, in the hope of procuring its approbation of various measures for the relief of the treasury. The proposal was adopted, and an assembly consisting of a hundred and thirty-four persons was accordingly convened in the year 1787[38]. The design of the minister was to endeavour to establish, with the sanction of this assembly[39], a general land-tax, to which all the orders of the state should be equally subjected, his other measures being proposed only for conciliating the popularity, without which this great revolution of finance must have been impracticable. But a measure which already in the preceding reign had been successfully resisted[40], and had recently driven Turgot from the ministry, could not be so readily effected. Instead of assenting to the proposal of the minister, the assembly required that the public accounts should be submitted to its inspection, which was the more

[34] Necker de la Revol. Franc., tome i. p. 15. [35] Ibid., p. 14.

[36] 'But, mortal pleasure, what art thou in truth?
The torrent's smoothness, ere it dash below.'—
Campbell's Gertrude of Wyoming.

[37] Mem., tome iii. p. 318. [38] Soulavie, tome vi. p. 129.

[39] Ibid., p. 132. [40] Ibid., p. 155.

reasonably demanded, as the thoughtless profusion of M. de Calonne had deprived him of the public confidence, and the origin of the deficiency of the revenue, more than half of which he had ascribed to the management of Necker, was the subject of a public controversy. The ancient forms of the government not having granted to the people the right of examining the expenditure of the state, the demand of the notables was resisted, the minister weakly imagining, that a fundamental change of taxation might be effected, without admitting a correspondent change in the proceedings of the government. Then was heard from La Fayette the very natural suggestion of assembling the states general. To avert this measure the king dismissed the minister.

There was still perhaps time for the king of France to prevent, not a change of the government, but a violent convulsion, if, *even in this his day, he had known the things belonging to his peace.* Necker has even professed his persuasion[41], that, if himself had then been the object of the choice of his sovereign, none of the events, which afterwards happened, would have occurred; and it is possible that, possessed as he then was of the confidence of the people, and disposed as he was to make concessions suitable to the emergency, he might have been able to accommodate the government to the altered circumstances of the nation. It has been a fashion to censure this financier as a weak partisan of popularity, incapable of guiding the government through the difficulties of such a crisis. He appears however to have been the only person connected with the court, who *discerned the signs of the times*, and with a provident sagacity endeavoured to render less violent and abrupt the changes, which he saw to be inevitable. Condemned notwithstanding on the one hand by the royalists, who had seen the government perish in his hands, and on the other disregarded by the republicans, who were eager for projects of more extensive change, he has, in the sudden depreciation of his character, paid the inevitable penalty of unsuccessful moderation.

Calonne was dismissed, but Necker was not immediately restored. In the short interval the finances were intrusted to the archbishop of Toulouse, who tore away the buttresses, which might have continued to support the ancient pile of

[41] De la Revol. Franc., tome i. p. 18.

the government, thus rendering its fall unavoidable. This minister, whom Marmontel has happily described as an aged child[42], still a stranger to the age in which he lived, first quarrelled with the notables, and dissolved their assembly, and then, with the same unbending violence, drove the parliament[43], though by its general policy adverse to such a measure, to demand that the states general should be assembled. A stamp-duty having been proposed to this body, it required that the public accounts should be submitted to its inspection; and, when this was refused, as not within its competence, it repeated the demand of the states general, which had been before made by the notables. The king replied by sending an edict for the establishment of a general land-tax. The parliament assembled the peers, that they might receive the support of their authority, and these joined in the demand of the convocation of the states general. The immediate issue of the struggle was that the parliament was banished from the capital[44]. The remote one was the dismissal of the minister and the recall of Necker.

Even in this extreme struggle Necker conceived[45], that every part of the nation would have gratefully accepted an offer of a constitution similar to that of Great Britain; but unhappily, he adds, the king could not be induced to consent. So favourable indeed was the opportunity of conciliation, that the leader of the opposition in the parliament[46], addressing himself to the king, declared that, if he would but promise, that the states general should be assembled in the following year, the financial edicts should receive an immediate acquiescence. If the minister had complied, the necessities of the government might have been relieved before the meeting of the states general, and he might have been enabled to direct the proceedings of that body with independence, and therefore with success. He chose however to enforce the pretension of absolute authority, which was then at variance with every feeling of the nation. He was

[42] Mém., tome iv. p. 8. [43] Soulavie, tome vi. pp. 177, 178.
[44] All the parliaments of the kingdom protested against the banishment of the parliament of the capital, demanding, like it, the condemnation of M. de Calonne, and the convocation of the states general.—Ibid., p. 178. [45] De la Revol. Franc., tome i. pp. 132, 133.
[46] Mém. de Marmontel, tome iv. p. 18.

in the issue compelled to promise the desired convocation of the states general, without having previously obtained the relief of the finances; and he was finally necessitated to solicit the recall of Necker, who on the other hand, refusing to associate himself with him, stipulated for his dismissal.

The government, feeble and fainting, had at this time received a mortal wound, and the statesman, who a few months sooner might perhaps have prolonged its existence by a reasonable alteration of its habit, seems to have been then called in but to close its eyes, and to attend its funeral. The time of conciliation having been wasted, Necker appears to have seen no remaining hope, except in procuring for the crown the support of the commons against the privileged orders. With this view he favoured the measure, which has drawn down upon him the execrations of the friends of the ancient government, the allowance of such a number of representatives to the third estate, as was equal to the united numbers of the representatives of the nobles and the clergy. This measure eventually consolidated the three bodies into one national assembly, the representatives of the third estate, assisted by some individuals of each of the other bodies, soon declaring themselves to be the representatives of the people without any separation into distinct chambers; and the national assembly, not being balanced and controlled by any constitutional body, speedily overpowered the monarchy, and assumed the entire government of the state.

Before we pronounce our judgment on the wisdom of the measure, which actually led to an issue so disastrous, it is to be considered whether any other would have satisfied the exasperated impatience of the people. Though the privileged orders did at last consent to submit themselves to that general assessment, which had become indispensably necessary to the relief of the government; their consent had been slowly obtained, and was indeed extorted by the apprehension of the operation of this very measure, in effecting it without their concurrence. The notables too, in their desire of conciliating popularity, had already required that, in the provincial states then proposed to be convened[47], the third estate should be allowed to have the half of the voices,

[47] Mém. de Marmontel, tome iv. p. 40.

though when they were again convened by Necker, that he might procure their sanction for the adoption of a similar arrangement in the constitution of the states general, they had repented of their determination, and refused to concur. In the last struggle moreover of the archbishop of Toulouse[48], the province of Dauphiny, one of the three provinces which enjoyed the privilege of assembling their states[49], actually formed an assembly according to this proportion of representatives. Would then a nation so excited, as France was at this time, have been satisfied with a representation less favourable to the commons? Would a representation formed agreeably to a different model, have abolished those exclusive privileges[50], which divided a great nation into castes, and constituted the radical principle of the public disorders? Though indeed such a constitution of the states general was hostile to the privileges of the nobility and clergy, Necker still cherished a hope, that the authority of the sovereign might yet be successfully employed in preserving among the different orders such a degree of harmony, as might avert the last fatal extremity; but the same malignant influence of secret intrigue[51], which had rendered the latter half of this reign irritating to the public feeling, again interposed, and by altering the speech, to be delivered by the monarch in addressing the assembled states, converted into poison, that which by the minister had been designed to be the balm of reconciliation and peace. It had been agreed, that the king should recommend that, on this particular occasion, the three orders should deliberate together. This was changed, and a permanent union of the three orders was soon afterwards forced upon him by the people.

Such were the circumstances, in which was begun a revolution, once hailed by the friends of liberty as the epoch of man's temporal redemption, but which soon proved to be the commencement of a long series of deplorable calamities

48 Mém. de Marmontel, tome iv. pp. 27, 28. 49 These were Brittany, Dauphiny, and Bearne; situated at the several extremities of the kingdom, as if the better to exhibit the example of liberty to the rest. 50 The distinction of the higher and lower orders had even been rendered more rigorous in this very reign, the king having, in the American war, approved a regulation for excluding from military commissions all persons not noble.—Soulavie, tome iv. p. 371.

51 Necker de la Revol. Franc., tome i. pp. 202, &c.

to France and to all Europe. Too sanguine surely were the hopes of the benevolent and the liberal, who mistook for a salutary crisis of meliorated order the last sad convulsion of an expiring government. A melancholy experience has to the reflecting afforded an abundant conviction, that the inventions of metaphysic ingenuity will not regenerate a state; that the intoxication of popular ardour, however powerful to destroy, is absolutely incapable of constructing a constitution. Perhaps the pride of man required this afflicting lesson, for maintaining the tranquillity of governments in a period of diffused intelligence and mental activity. Perhaps a process less violent would have been insufficient for reducing into a new and improved combination the scattered elements of an exhausted government. Perhaps the ruined system of the federative policy of Europe could not, except by the agitations of such a revolution, have been prepared for entering into a new combination embracing more numerous interests, and fitted for a widely extended scene of action. Of this at least we are certain, that the energies, developed in the mighty struggles of the French revolution, have been the agents in that great and general convulsion of the political world, which has broken down whatever yet remained of the federative relations of Europe.

In contemplating the arrangements of the providential government of the world, it is most interesting to remark, how the different, and apparently independent parts, are mutually accommodated, to produce a common result. Such a view has been already exhibited in the connexion discoverable between the process, by which the government of England was separately perfected at the revolution, and that other process, by which the political system of Europe was just at that time prepared for receiving advantage from the interposition, which the British government was then enabled to exercise, and by the very circumstances of its domestic revolution compelled to undertake. It is even in this case remarkable, that the individual prince, who formed and maintained the continental combinations of policy, into which the British government was then to be received, was also the chief agent of the revolution which completed the improvement of its constitution. In the revolution of France a mutual accommodation of independent agencies is not less

distinctly discoverable, though of a contrary nature. This was apparent in the connection of the ruin of the general system, with the destruction of the particular government, from which the system had originally emanated, and by which it was afterwards chiefly supported. In this case the destruction of the government of France completed the dissolution of the general system, as in the other the perfected adjustment of the constitution of England was the main operation, by which the general system of Europe was, for that period, arranged and established.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the history of Great Britain, from the commencement of the reign of George I. in the year 1714, *to the resignation of Sir Robert Walpole in the year* 1742.

George I. king in the year 1714—Rebellion of Scotland, 1715—The septennial act, 1716—The mutiny-law and war with Spain, 1718—The war concluded, 1719—The South Sea scheme, 1720—George II. king, 1727—The rise of methodism, 1729—War with Spain, 1739—The secession of Whitfield, 1741—Resignation of Walpole, 1742.

THE subject of the remaining chapters is the history of the governments of Great Britain and Ireland through the eighteenth century. The review of the general policy of Europe has been prosecuted to the great crisis, constituted by the revolution of France. It remains to examine the later history of the British government, not merely as it was an important part of the past system of Europe, but yet more as it may preserve for the improvement of the coming age the best results of those, by which it shall have been preceded. The wreck of Europe in the French revolution sends back our recollection to that other disastrous period, in which the western empire of Rome was broken into its component states; and as, in that calamitous crisis, the eastern empire was still upheld, to preserve during the long confusion of the middle ages a secure deposit of human refinement, so may we hope that the British empire may still subsist through a long series of agitations, even now

far from being completed, to present to the recovering nations a noble example of all, which past ages had been able to effect for the improvement and happiness of man.

The awakening events of the revolutionary war aroused to a serious consideration of the Almighty's providence the minds even of practised politicians[1], who have hesitated to avow, that they regarded the despot of the European continent as a man raised up by that providence, to be the agent of great and fearful revolutions. He may indeed be acknowledged to have been, as he was named in the language of French adulation, 'the man of providence,' though in the same sense, in which the visitations of heaven would be recognised in the desolations of the hurricane, or the pestilence. But if he, who had almost destroyed the independence of the continent of Europe, be the man of providence, what should be pronounced of the nation, which opposed an insuperable boundary to his violence? Shall the instrumentality of a providential agent be discovered in the subverter of governments, and shall no such instrumentality be acknowledged in the nation, which controlled the enterprises of his ambition, and still shelters the hopes of posterity? This seems to be the high calling of the country, to which we have the fortune to belong. The investigation of the proximate causes, which have qualified it to fulfil that calling, is the grand and interesting subject of the remaining chapters.

The review of the history of the British empire has been prosecuted to the accession of the family of Brunswick. That event completed the parliamentary settlement of the crown[2], and thereby established on an immovable basis the independence of the constitution. The power of the sovereign was thenceforward derived from the same source with the liberty of the subject; the claim of authority was from

[1] Mr. G. Ponsonby is represented as having used the following expressions in the debate on the claims of the Roman Catholics in the house of Commons, in the year 1810. 'Bonaparte was one of those persons, that seem employed by Providence to effect great revolutions. They ought not to deceive themselves; he was one of the greatest personages in modern times, and commanded a people not less ambitious, nor less vicious than himself.'

[2] The house of Savoy should regularly have possessed the British throne, as it derived its right from Henrietta daughter of Charles I., whereas the right of the house of Hanover was derived from Elizabeth daughter of James I.

this time indissolubly connected with the pretension of freedom in one common charter, and the entire government of Great Britain became one great national incorporation of political right. In the interval also, which was interposed between the commencement and the completion of this important arrangement, a favourable opportunity had occurred, for perfecting the combination of the two kingdoms of Great Britain, and thus at once securing the domestic tranquillity of the greater, and extending to the less improved the advantages of a better constitution of government, and the resources of a more cultivated industry. Much however remained to be done for perfecting the government under this new arrangement, for determining the foreign dependencies of a great commercial empire, and for effecting that other union, which was still required for the consolidation of its strength.

As the occasion of the accession of the Hanoverian family approached, the two great parties of Whigs and Tories became competitors for the favour of the future sovereign. It ill accorded with the principles of the Tories, that they should seek to connect themselves with a family, whose power was the creature of parliamentary authority, not the offspring of hereditary right; but the temporary ascendency of the Whigs had thrown them into opposition, and in the desire of supplanting their adversaries they overlooked the inconsistency of their own conduct. The overtures of the Whigs prevailed. As they were actually possessed of power, having forced themselves into the ministry in almost the last moments of the queen, they could proffer more immediate and effective service; and it was probably felt that their support was more congenial to the new settlement of the crown.

In the reigns of William and Anne the government had fluctuated between the two parties. William through policy employed both parties in his ministries, but showed some natural predilection in favour of the Whigs. Anne was not less inclined towards the Tories, than her predecessor towards their adversaries, yet was compelled by the difficulty of her situation to assign to the latter, during a great portion of her reign, the conduct of the government. This fluctuation ceased at the accession of the first of the Hano-

verian sovereigns. The Whigs from that time held possession of power during the reign of that prince, and seventeen years of the reign of his successor, or during the long period of thirty years.

The long continuance of the authority of the Whigs was probably in a great degree the result of the intimate concern, which was felt by those princes in the political relations of the continent of Europe. Neither of them could, like George III., boast that he had been born a Briton; their habits were all formed to the interests of their continental principality, their minds clinging with affectionate attachment to the scene of the earlier greatness of their family. In these circumstances it was natural, that they should willingly delegate the management of their new dominions to the party, to which their family was chiefly indebted for its advancement to the British throne. The elevation of William had been partly the work of the Tories, whom the bigotry of James had forced into a union with the Whigs; but the settlement made in favour of the Hanoverian family had been more particularly the work of the latter party. The earlier princes of this family were accordingly less disposed than that monarch, to endeavour to combine in the service of the state the efforts of the two parties, or to control the pretensions of each by granting a temporary ascendency to the other. A ministry composed of both parties was first formed by a prince of the reigning family in the year 1744.

The alternations of parties in the two reigns next following the revolution served to moderate their violence, and to prepare them for a gradual approximation. Occupying in succession the same political situations, they learned to argue from the same principles, and in the changing struggle frequently forgot their peculiar and characteristic tenets. When the two parties had been thus moderated, it must have been advantageous that the balance of official advancement should incline steadily towards the friends of liberty. The division of the two parties was still too distinctly marked for permitting a permanent ministry to be compounded from both. A choice was necessarily to be made between them in selecting the persons, by whom the business of the government should be conducted; and a long continued as-

cendency of the Whigs bestowed the double advantage of supporting in official station the principles of freedom moderated by the possession of power, and of disposing the Tories in opposition to adopt more and more of the independence, which characterised their adversaries.

The circumstances of these earlier sovereigns were not less favourable to the development of a free constitution, than their ministerial arrangements. Menaced, and even assailed, by the exiled family, they were necessitated to recur perpetually to the great maxims of independent right, by which alone they could justify their occupation of the throne. They were never suffered to forget, that their power was identified with the liberty of those, by whom it had been conferred, for they found it expedient to make frequent appeals to the principles, to the influence of which they were indebted for the acquisition. If the bigoted tyranny of James II. gave the impulse to the revolution, the continued pretension of his family maintained the efficacy of its operation on the government. In this view also the permanent power of the Whigs was best adapted to the circumstances of the country, for they could most strenuously resist the pretension of the Stuarts, while an opposition composed of Tories might even afford some encouragement to their partisans.

The revolution in terminating the system of governing by a prerogative beyond the control of the parliament, induced a necessity of new checks and balances, which might supply the deficiency of the ancient prerogative, and, maintaining the combination of a mixed and complex constitution, enable it to protect, and to improve, the various, and frequently interfering interests, of a powerful and wealthy nation. It was not indeed to be brought back to the state, from which it had been rescued at the revolution: but it required to be furnished with other means of securing its own continuance, and of discharging with efficiency the functions of a free government.

On this occasion, as in the civil war of the preceding century, the impulse was received from Scotland, though under a contrary influence, a plan of rebellion being formed there[3] among the friends of the exiled family, to be sup-

[3] Sir W. Scott has produced a curious document thus entitled: "Address of one hundred and two chief heritors and heads of clans in

ported by a powerful conspiracy in England. The Scotish rebellion broke out, and was crushed, in the year 1715; and in the following year the result of this unsuccessful effort of disaffection was seen in the enactment of the law, for permitting that a parliament should continue assembled during seven, instead of three years, which gave stability and importance to the representation of the commons.

Of this law, which has been severely censured as an unauthorised exertion of legislative power, it has been remarked[4], that the legislature was certainly competent to repeal the law, by which the duration of a parliament had been limited to three years, and that the simple repeal of that act would have left the possible continuance of a parliament to be limited only by the life of the reigning sovereign. In regard also to its influence on the constitution, the speaker Onslow[5], who was highly respected for his attachment to the true principles of the government, was frequently heard to declare, that the enactment of this law constituted the epoch of the emancipation of the British house of commons from its former dependence on the crown and the house of lords; and even lord Somers gave his entire approbation to the measure, professing to regard it as the greatest support possible to the liberty of the country. It is certain indeed that the septennial law has invested the house of commons with greater importance in the constitution; but it appears to have done this rather by rendering it less liable to be influenced by the unsteady prejudices of the multitude[6] and therefore more qualified to act as the controlling senate of a great country.

the highlands of Scotland to King George the First, on his accession to the throne, which by court intrigue was prevented from being delivered to His Majesty: the consequence was their joining in the rebellion in the year 1715." This he believed to be genuine. "It is said," he remarks, "to have been delivered to Archibald, duke of Argyle, to be presented by him to the new sovereign: but that nobleman, being a politician as well as a soldier, is alleged to have seen more prospect of personal aggrandisement in an insurrection, which would render his services indispensable, than in a peaceful submission of the Highlands to the house of Hanover."—Misc. Prose Works, vol. xx. pp. 57, &c. [4] Christian's Note on Blackstone's Comm. vol. i. p. 189. London, 1809. [5] Coxe's Mem. of Sir Robert Walpole, vol. i. pp. 128, 130. London, 1800. [6] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. p. 318.

The house of commons, in this improved arrangement, is no longer the mere representative of the lower orders of the state, contending for power with the sovereign and the nobles. It is itself the grand council of the nation; and, however the interposition of the lords may still be occasionally necessary for restraining the undue influence of popular pretensions, it comprises within itself a balance of contending interests, which generally secures the steadiness of the public measures. But this measure, though beneficial to the constitution, was not easily reconciled to the principles of the Whigs, by whom it was introduced; nor could it have been at all adopted, if the actual circumstances of the government had not proved it to be necessary. The accession of the first prince of the family of Brunswick had been almost immediately succeeded by an insurrection in favour of the pretender, and the country in the year 1717 was still so much influenced by disaffection, that the minister could not venture to encounter the hazard of a general election.

This measure gave stability and importance to the representative part of the legislature. Others, which in the like manner arose out of the actual circumstances of the time, contributed to the support of the executive authority. The first of these was the riot-act, suggested by the disturbances agitating the country in the commencement of the reign of George I., even before disaffection was manifested in rebellion. A yet more important addition was afterwards made to the strength of the executive power, by passing a mutiny-bill, which authorised courts martial to inflict capital punishments. The altered circumstances of the country had proved the necessity of maintaining some regular forces in time of peace[7], and such a law, though it conceded a portion of the general freedom, was indispensable to their due regulation. Before the civil war no standing army existed; in the reign of Charles II. the guards were about five thousand men; and in the interval between the peace of

[7] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 344—346. Tindal says that the forces to be maintained at this time were limited to sixteen thousand three hundred and forty-seven men, but that a new conspiracy gave occasion to an augmentation of four thousand, which was continued.—Contin. of Rapin, pp. 898, 976.

Ryswick and the war of the Spanish succession, the commons could not be induced to maintain more than seven thousand. The number of troops annually demanded, after some variations in the earlier years of George I., rather exceeded seventeen thousand men, exclusively of the Irish establishment. Before the year 1718 mutiny and desertion were cognisable, as capital offences, only by the civil magistrate. They were then made punishable by courts martial, but only by an annual law, so that, if it should not be in each year renewed by the legislature, the army would be virtually disbanded.

An attempt made to effect a change of the constitution in relation to the peerage, was baffled by the jealousy of the commons. It was proposed to limit the number of English peers[8], so that it should never exceed by more than six the actual number[9], twenty-five hereditary peers of Scotland being at the same time substituted for the sixteen, who by election represented the peerage of that country in the united parliament. The alleged principle of the measure was the necessity of preventing a repetition of such an exercise of prerogative, as that by which Anne, in creating twelve peers at once, on the dismissal of the duke of Marlborough in the year 1711, had procured a majority in the house of lords. But it was believed[10], and even acknowledged, that the chief motive for introducing it was the desire of restraining the future power of the prince of Wales, who was adverse to the existing ministry. The lords were not averse from a regulation, which would increase their individual importance by limiting their number, and establish their independence by precluding a minister from creating a sudden majority. The commons however, who did not choose to place an obstacle in the way of their own advancement, very generally rejected the bill. The most strenuous opponent of the measure was Mr. Walpole, afterwards Sir Robert Walpole, who unanswerably urged[11], that it would destroy the balance of the

[8] Contin. of Rapin, pp. 915, 916. [9] At this time, besides the prince of Wales and the duke of York, there were a hundred and seventy-six temporal peers, so that the whole number of the house of lords, including twenty-six archbishops and bishops, and the sixteen peers of Scotland, was two hundred and twenty.—Ibid., p. 915,

[10] Mem. of Sir Robert Walpole, vol. i. pp. 201, 204. [11] Ibid., p. 213.

constitution, by controlling a prerogative of the crown, which precluded the entire independence of the peerage. The crown, he argued, is dependent upon the commons by their power of granting money; the commons are dependent on the crown by the power of dissolution; the lords would by such a regulation be made independent of both. It was accordingly, and wisely determined, that the royal prerogative should continue unrestrained, except by a consideration of constitutional propriety; and it has so happened, that the example of Anne, in creating a number of peers for the purpose of gaining a majority on a specific question, has not hitherto been imitated, though, in the increased number of the peerage, a number larger by two has been simultaneously created.

The same statesman, who distinguished himself by opposing this ill-judged plan of innovation, was soon afterwards yet more conspicuous by his salutary efforts for repairing the mischiefs, which had been caused by the extravagant speculations of the South Sea company. This association had been formed in the preceding reign, for facilitating an arrangement of the unfunded part of the public debt[12], which had amounted nearly to ten millions. In the nine years which had since elapsed, various disappointments had occurred, which might have undeceived the persons concerned in the project; but so ardent was still the disposition to seek extraordinary advantages by commercial enterprise, that in the year 1720 the ministry undertook to avail themselves of it for lightening the national incumbrances. In the infancy of the funding system it had been found necessary to attract the confidence of the public, by offering advantageous annuities for terms of years extending nearly to a century. These by the condition of the bargain were irredeemable; and, as they amounted almost to eight hundred thousand pounds annually[13], it was judged to be expedient for reducing the public charges, to encourage the persons, by whom they were held, to subscribe them into the funds of the South Sea company, and thus afford an opportunity of converting them into a redeemable stock. This part of the scheme Sir John Sinclair has represented as highly beneficial[14]. Unfortunately,

[12] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. p. 218. [13] Ibid., p. 221.
[14] Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. pp. 491, 492.

he adds, other advantages were sought from a competition between the company and the bank, in which the former was induced to offer proposals, securing to the public a profit of more than four millions and a half, and presenting a prospect of an additional profit of nearly three millions more. This competition, and the extravagant offers, which it occasioned, while they loaded the project with an insupportable burden, inflamed the imagination of the public. It was concluded, that there must be advantages far greater than those, which were presented to the general observation; and by the heated passions of the multitude on the one hand, and the artifices of overstrained speculation on the other, the scheme was speedily perverted into a monstrous combination of folly and deceit.

The most strenuous exertions were employed by Walpole[15], to dissuade the house of commons from adopting a measure, which he saw to be pregnant with injurious consequences, and which indeed the recent experience of France, in the scheme of the Mississippi-company, had sufficiently proved to be disastrous. The scheme was however eagerly adopted by the legislature and the public. The frenzy of speculating on the sudden acquisition of wealth had pervaded every order of the nation, and it has been computed that nearly a hundred different projects, which were aptly denominated *bubbles*, were at this time encouraged and supported[16]. But a very short period was sufficient for demonstrating the futility of a plan, which had been regarded as offering the infallible means of pouring into the country the wealth of Spanish America. In the space of eight months were seen the rise, the progress, and the fall of this great system of delusion[17]; and Walpole was then called to repair by his prudence the calamities, which he had laboured to prevent.

The South Sea scheme, though it produced much distress to individuals, was by no means prejudicial to the public. The long annuities, which stood in the way of every scheme for the reduction of the national debt, had been subscribed into its funds, and had been thereby transformed into redeemable securities, the saving from which transaction Sir John Sinclair[18] has estimated to amount very nearly to eight

[15] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. p. 225. [16] Tindal, p. 939.
[17] Ibid., p. 994. [18] Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 494.

millions and a half. Perhaps another advantage yet more important arose from this temporary frenzy. The nation did not indeed, like France, require, that its commercial activity should be excited by the stimulating influence of a great crisis of speculation. In a country already commercial the exposure of the folly and the mischief of extravagant speculation would naturally restrain within the limits of prudence that appetite of gain, which is the principle of commercial industry. It is therefore reasonable to believe that, when a considerable empire had been subsequently acquired in India by a mercantile corporation, the example of the South Sea company may have usefully served to moderate the speculations, which were suggested by a combination so extraordinary of commercial monopoly and territorial dominion.

Walpole, whose exertions were thus important in extricating the nation from its difficulties, had been appointed to one of the inferior places of the government in the reign of Anne, so early as in the year 1705, and three years afterwards had been made secretary at war. With the discarded whig-administration he resigned his office, though he might have continued to hold it. He returned to office at the accession of George I., and in the following year was placed at the head of the treasury. This office he resigned after two years, was restored to it in the year 1721, and from that time continued to hold it, together with the direction of the government, to the year 1742, when a war with Spain, begun three years before under the influence of popular clamour, compelled him to retire.

This minister has been described by his enemies as the father of political corruption, having with a coarse disregard of common decency, established a regular traffic in the dishonesty of the national legislators. Burke, who was no advocate for corruption, but might be partial to the great minister of the Whigs, has given a very different representation of him. He has described him as very far from governing by corruption [19], and has even asserted, that the charge of systematic corruption is perhaps less applicable to him, than to any minister, who ever served the crown for so great a length of time. He has however admitted enough, to justify the imputation of having been the first minister,

[19] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. iii. pp. 344, 345.

who reduced corruption to a system. A government of influence had succeeded to a government of prerogative; and though it be true, as is alleged, that he governed chiefly by party-attachments, and gained over few from the opposition, it cannot be questioned, that he embraced every opportunity of addressing himself to the private interest of individuals. It is certain that a very large sum[20], under the head of secret-service-money, was annually expended without account. This practice of direct bribery continued long afterwards, and is generally supposed to have ceased only about the termination of the American war.

In other views of the conduct of Walpole, we find characteristics claiming our respect. Though zealously attached to the Hanoverian family of our sovereigns, he was adverse to those continental engagements, which tended to involve the government in war. The love of peace was the appropriate distinction of his policy; and he was attentive to employ the opportunity, which was afforded by the public tranquillity, in developing the commercial resources of his country, and reducing the finances to an orderly arrangement. If his desire of peace was sometimes indulged to a degree not reconcilable to the interest, or to the dignity of the nation, it should be remembered that he appears to have employed his policy in inducing cardinal Fleury to neglect the French marine[21], and that the public resources[22], so much improved under his pacific administration, were the very engines, by which the great war-minister of Britain soon afterwards effectually humbled the house of Bourbon. Dean Tucker has called him the best commercial minister[23], whom the country had ever produced; and it was said of him, that he found the book of rates the worst, and left it the best in Europe. To his financial ability lord Chatham bore a public testimony[24]. Such indeed was the confidence, which he inspired, that the only apprehension of the monied men was that the debts of the nation might be too rapidly discharged[25].

[20] Hallam's Constit. Hist., vol. iii. pp. 353, 354. [21] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. iii. p. 331. [22] Ibid., p. 332. [23] Ibid., pp. 336, 337. [24] Ibid., p. 335. [25] His desire of reducing the national debt was controlled by the necessity of diminishing the land-tax, to conciliate the Tories, and by that of relinquishing the plan of an excise.

That the first sovereign of the family of Brunswick should connect himself with a minister, thus steadily devoted to the domestic interests of Great Britain, was a very felicitous combination. It was the natural tendency of the establishment of a family of continental princes on the throne of these countries, that they should be involved in the political relations belonging to its original dominions; and to a certain degree this tendency has actually influenced the policy of Great Britain. It was however very important that the tendency should be moderated. The act of settlement had accordingly guarded against it by an express provision, and even by restraining the sovereign from visiting his continental dominions, unless the consent of the parliament should have been previously obtained. As this latter stipulation was speedily repealed, because it was esteemed offensive to the king, so it may be easily believed that the former would have had little operation, unless supported by the influence of a minister, whom the king found it inconvenient to dismiss.

The short suspension of the power of Walpole was indeed principally occasioned [26] by the steadiness, with which he adhered to his principle of declining, as much as possible, the embarrassments of continental engagements. A dispute had arisen between the duke and the nobles of Mecklenburg, which afforded to the emperors of Russia and Germany, the king of Prussia, and the elector of Hanover, an occasion of interposing in the concerns of the duchy for the advancement of their private interests. In this contest Walpole refused to embark the British government; and, when his friend Townshend had, on account of their joint opposition, been dismissed from his office of principal secretary of state, he insisted on resigning his own situation.

This interruption of the power of a minister, who afterwards maintained, during twenty-one years, his station at the head of the government, bore a remarkable relation to

Lord Chatham afterwards acknowledged in parliament, that he blamed himself for having resisted this plan of taxation. [26] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. p. 159. The other occasions were a misunderstanding between the king and the prince of Wales, the intrigues and arrogance of the king's German ministers and favourites, and of his two mistresses: and the cabals of the earl of Sunderland, one of the British ministers.

all the interests of the state, both foreign and domestic. Walpole was notoriously a bad war-minister, as he was on the other hand a careful and skilful manager of the domestic interests of the country. The preservation of peace was accordingly the primary object of his foreign policy, and the improvement of the trade and revenue of his country was the triumph of his talents.

The abdication of such a minister, at such a time, afforded in the first place, a necessary interval for an exertion of the national vigour, which was then indispensable, the restless mind of Alberoni, at that time the chief minister of Spain, having excited disturbances, which menaced the general tranquillity of Europe. The efforts of Alberoni were indeed eventually instrumental to the completion of the unfinished arrangements of the treaty of Utrecht; but they required to be resisted at the time, that the balance between Spain and Austria might be duly maintained, and that the former might not assume a position inconsistent with the interest of Great Britain. It well accorded with this situation of affairs, that Walpole should not be at this time minister, for in this interval the rising marine of Spain was crushed by a British fleet, and those modifications of the treaty of Utrecht were begun, which were perfected by the issue of the war of the year 1739, that finally drove him from the helm of government.

It was in the same interval, on the other hand, that the South Sea scheme was formed and matured. When the mischievous consequences of that project had opened the eyes of the nation, this statesman was called to remedy the evils, which he would have prevented; and he successfully exerted his financial talents in alleviating, as much as possible, the sufferings of the public. If indeed he had continued in office, he might perhaps, by the assistance of the bank[27], have adopted a better method of converting the irredeemable into redeemable annuities; but in this case the fever of speculation would not have been permitted to teach a practical lesson of prudence, which was perhaps indispensable for preserving sound commercial health in a wealthy and growing empire.

It has been alleged that the British government 'was

[27] Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. p. 225.

steered by a Hanoverian rudder.' Such was naturally the wish of its princes, partial to their original dominions, and accustomed to the views, which belonged to the former situation of the family. It does not however appear, that the interests of these countries were ever actually, in any case of considerable importance, rendered subservient to those of the electorate. A great country could not rationally be indifferent to the equilibrium of the European powers, and it was therefore the interest of our government to concern itself in perfecting the arrangements, which had been begun by the treaty of Utrecht. The war with Spain, the only war which occurred within the period at present considered, was a part of the process; and the acquisition of Bremen and Verden[28], while it gave to our government the command of the only inlets from the British seas into Germany, served to protect the British trade with Hamburgh, which would have been exposed to danger, if these provinces had continued to be connected with Sweden, or had been transferred to Denmark. The treaty of Hanover, concluded in the year 1725 with France and Prussia, was in its principle, notwithstanding its name, a British treaty[29], and was even opposed by the king and his German ministers, as endangering his German dominions.

An important change was effected in the executive government by the accession of the family of Hanover[30], as it wholly separated the deliberations of the ministerial cabinet from the presence of the king. A cabinet, as distinguished from the privy-council, may be found so far back as in the

[28] This was effected by a treaty concluded with Sweden in the year 1719, on a condition of sending a strong squadron into the Baltic, to procure from Russia equitable conditions of peace for that country.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 252. In this measure Walpole and his friend Townshend concurred. Townshend named them the gates of the empire, and estimated their importance in reference to the tranquillity of the continent; Walpole considered them in reference to British commerce, as commanding the navigation of the Elbe and the Weser.—Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. pp. 148—150. [29] The determinate objects of the treaty are stated by Mr. Coxe to have been the preservation of Gibraltar, the abolition of a trading company established by the emperor at Ostend, and perhaps the frustration of a plan for restoring the Stuarts, supposed to have been contained in secret articles of a treaty concluded at Vienna.—Ibid., p. 435.

[30] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. p. 389.

reign of Charles I.[31], though its measures were submitted to the latter for approval. After the restoration, and especially after the fall of Clarendon, Charles II., in his desire of attaining to arbitrary power, gave his approbation to the measures of the cabinet, before they were communicated to the privy council, so that the acquiescence of that body was reduced to a mere formality. In the reign of William a further step was taken to widen the distinction, the measures only, and not the reasons for adopting them, being made known to the privy-council. That king was however in a great degree his own minister, and both he and Anne were occasionally present at the deliberations of the cabinet. On the accession of the Hanoverian family the whole business of arranging the measures of the government was resigned to the ministers. The first prince of that family, being ignorant of the English language, could not obtain much insight into the domestic concerns of his kingdom, and was so devoted to the interests of his electorate, that he was contented with employing in advancing them the name and importance of his new dominion. His son also, though in some degree acquainted with the English language, and more jealous of his prerogative, was sensible of his incapacity to determine the measures of the English government, and gave almost his whole attention to the politics of Germany.

The ecclesiastical establishment of England could not fail to be influenced by the accession of a family of princes, which was thrown by circumstances on the support of the Whigs. Though it had previously formed the strength of the genuine Tories, as distinguished from the Jacobites, and long continued to maintain generally the principles of that party, yet among those, who were more immediately connected with the court, a change of political opinion soon began to be discoverable. The champion of the new, which were named low-church opinions, was Benjamin Hoadley, who was successively appointed to the bishoprics of Bangor and Winchester. He had distinguished himself in the reign of Anne by justifying in his sermons the right of resistance, and had on that account been recommended by the house of commons to the patronage of the queen[32], who

[31] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. p. 252. [32] Tindal's Contin. of Rapin, p. 628.

however did not think proper to comply with their request. Early in the following reign he was promoted to the see of Bangor. Not long afterwards he gave occasion to the extinction of the power of the convocation[33], having drawn upon himself by a publication and a sermon an attack of the lower house of the ecclesiastical parliament. The triumph of the low-church-party was in the year 1723 completed by the statute, which sentenced to banishment and deprivation the celebrated bishop Atterbury for engaging in a conspiracy to place the pretender on the throne.

While the established church was admitting this new modification of its character, its old adversaries, the Presbyterians, were undergoing a change, which altered the state of the controversy between the two bodies. The original Presbyterians had so far agreed with the established church in regard to articles of faith, that they were considered as dissenting solely on the question of ecclesiastical government. When therefore William procured in their favour an act of toleration[34], it was deemed sufficient to extend it to those, who should acknowledge the doctrinal articles of the establishment. But the Presbyterians did not persevere long in this doctrinal conformity[35]. The doctrine of the Socinians[36] appears to have prevailed so much among them

[33] Tindal's Continuation of Rapin, pp. 883—885. The convocation was that of Canterbury, that of York never having been important. It consists, since the reformation, of the suffragan bishops, forming an upper house, and of the deans, archdeacons, a proctor from each chapter, and two elected by the parochial clergy of each diocese, constituting a lower house. The power of enacting new canons, except with the royal license, having been taken away by a statute of Henry VIII., and, even subject to this condition, being limited by several later statutes, and by the authority of the courts of law, the convocation has had little business except to grant subsidies, which however, from the time of Henry VIII., have been always confirmed by an act of parliament; and this practice of ecclesiastical taxation was silently discontinued in the year 1664, after which, but from what time is uncertain, the parochial clergy have exercised the right of voting in the election of members of the house of commons. After the revolution, and especially in the beginning of the reign of Anne, the party adverse to the new order claimed for the convocation a right of watching over the interests of the church, especially the lower house, the bishops being considered as Whigs.—Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 324—328.

[34] Tindal. pp. 883—885. [35] Ibid., p. 33. [36] 'Many publications, tending rather to Socinianism than Arianism, were put forth

from the time of the revolution, probably through the increased communication with the continent, and latterly, it has been thought[37], through the encouragement afforded by some Arian members of the established church, especially the celebrated doctor Clarke, that in the debate of the house of commons, which occurred in the year 1772, on a petition of the clergy, it was stated that the statute of William had ceased to be an act of toleration. This inconvenience has been remedied by the increasing mildness of the government, and congregations may now be lawfully assembled for the exercise of every kind of worship, which acknowledges the existence of a God, and the divine authority of the sacred writings.

In the year 1729 was begun at Oxford that association, which on account of the exemplary regularity of its members was speedily distinguished by the name of Methodists[38]. The founder of this society was John Wesley, a man of apostolic zeal, and of a sincere, though an extravagant and ill-regulated piety. Three years afterwards the society received into its number George Whitfield, who became the leader of the schism, by which it has since been divided. The division occurred in the year 1741[39], Whitfield having embraced the principles of Calvin, while Wesley adhered to the tenets of Arminius.

This association was not formed on a principle of separa-

towards the latter end of the seventeenth century, in Holland and in England. Petavius a Jesuit, Zwicker a Socinian, and Sandius an Anti-Trinitarian, were foremost among foreign writers of this description; against whom bishop Bull's first great work, his *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, was principally directed His subsequent tract, *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, had more immediate reference to the lax opinions of Episcopius and his disciple Curcellæus.—His last great treatise, *Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio*, in continuance of the same subject, was written expressly against Zwicker. The writers, who, at the same time, advocated these heterodox opinions in our own country, were not men of considerable eminence, and were little more than mere importers of these foreign novelties.'—Review of the Life and Writings of Doctor Waterland, prefixed to his Works, by Bishop Van Mildert, pp. 36, 37. Oxford, 1823. [37] Ibid., p. 129. Doctor Clarke published his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, which began a new era of controversy.—Ibid. p. 44. He was strenuously opposed by Doctor Waterland. [38] Myles's Chron. Hist. of Methodists, p. 3. Liverpool. [39] Ibid., p. 11.

tion, however it afterwards assumed the character of dissent. The Methodists differed indeed from the established church in their notion of regeneration[40], separating it from the sacrament of baptism, and looking to certain impulses or impressions, as perceptibly indicating a communication of the divine influence; but they long continued in communion with the church, not claiming to administer its rites for themselves. The admission however of many persons[41] who had previously been dissenters, and the spirit of opposition naturally arising between their preachers and the established clergy, put an end to this forbearance in the year 1751. The separation was made with acknowledged reluctance, for in the year 1788 it was declared in a solemn conference[42], that they were not conscious of varying from the established church in regard to doctrine, and that in those instances, in which they had at length deviated from its discipline, they had reluctantly yielded to necessity. A considerable portion, under the denomination of the old Wesleyan Methodists, still profess to adhere to the communion of the establishment. As a relaxation of the devotional spirit of the church, the evil consequence of undisturbed prosperity, seems to have given occasion to the formation of this sect, so may it have been useful in exciting that zeal, by which the church is now usefully and honourably characterised. Perhaps, in accounting for the abated fervour of the established clergy, we should ascend to a higher source, and ascribe it, in part at least, to the undue use of the higher patronage of the establishment, in supporting the system of governing by influence, which was commenced at the revolution.

40 Rev. of the Life and Writings of Waterland, p. 180. In this however they agreed with the low-church party, so far as related to the denial of baptismal regeneration. 41 Myles, p. 58.
42 Ibid., p. 136.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the history of Great Britain, from the resignation of Sir Robert Walpole in the year 1742, *to the beginning of the administration of Mr. Grenville in the year* 1763.

Second Scotish rebellion in the year 1745—Heretable jurisdictions of Scotland abolished, 1746—Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748—Seven-years' war begun, 1756—George III. king, 1760—Peace of Paris concluded, and administration of Mr. Grenville begun, 1763—The English novel begun by Fielding, 1750.

UNDER the administration of Sir Robert Walpole the commercial resources of the country had been considerably improved; its financial system, though still encumbered, had been much relieved; and two measures of legislation had given on the one hand new importance to the representative part of the government, and on the other new strength to the executive authority. The national desire of waging a vigorous war with Spain at length drove from the helm a minister devoted to the preservation of peace, and gave a beginning to a different system of administration, which seems to have been in its turn not less necessary to the aggrandisement of the empire. A military administration was substituted in the place of the commercial and fiscal government of Walpole, and after a few years the energies of the empire were wielded by the elder Pitt, who has recorded his fame in the successes of his country.

The great war-minister of the British government had displayed the extraordinary power of his eloquence even before the end of the administration of Walpole, who was heard to express his apprehension of 'that terrible cornet of horse[1].' and actually deprived him of his military commission for his determined opposition in parliament. But Pitt was not the successor, who supplied the place of the fallen minister. Walpole, perceiving that he could not longer retain the reins of power, provided for his safety by effecting a division of his adversaries, and introducing into

[1] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. ii. p. 427. Dubl., 1792.

the administration such only, as, he conceived, might be inclined to afford him protection. Of this portion of the opposition the leader was Mr. Pulteney, who however, to maintain the consistency of his conduct, declined an official situation, contenting himself with a peerage and a seat in the cabinet. The friends of the prince of Wales, among whom was the illustrious Pitt, were excluded from the negotiation. The military department was assigned to lord Carteret.

This nobleman was stigmatized by his new adversary as a political Quixote[2], whose violent rashness was as prejudicial, as the patient pusillanimity of his predecessor; but at a late period of his life the latter bore an honourable testimony to the talents of the former[3], professing to have been indebted to the advantage of his instructions 'in the upper departments of government.' Lord Carteret may therefore be considered as the precursor of lord Chatham, having directed the military exertions of the government in the war of the year 1739, as the latter directed those of the war of the year 1756, and having even contributed to the glories of this more brilliant period, by the influence of his talents in maturing the abilities of his more distinguished successor. Like lord Chatham too, he was eminently eloquent, though in a degree much inferior to that great orator; and, like him, he successfully employed his eloquence in rousing and animating the military energy of his country.

The war begun in the year 1739 had, like the subsequent war, two distinct origins. The quarrel of Great Britain with Spain was wholly commercial, whereas that of the continental powers, which became connected with the former, arose out of the disputed succession of the Austrian territories, in the same manner, as, in the seven-years' war, the contest of Great Britain and France, about the limits of their colonial possessions in America, gave one beginning to hostilities, while another was furnished by the rankling animosity with which the court of Austria was inflamed against Prussia, on account of the loss of the valuable province of Silesia. It thus happened in each of these wars,

[2] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. p. 68. [3] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 72.

that dissimilar and independent occasions of hostility presented themselves, about the same time, to the great potentates of the southern and principal system of Europe, involving their interests in one common contention, and generating in their respective results an important crisis of the entire combination. In the earlier was completed the adjustment of those arrangements, which had been begun by the treaty of Utrecht, but, in the difficulty of accommodating interests so various, had remained hitherto imperfect. In the later was begun the decline of the European system, and new arrangements were formed in correspondence to its decay.

The Spanish contest arose out of the interference of the colonial establishments of the two states[4], the pacific administration of Walpole having given encouragement to the violences of the Spanish government. War was at length demanded of the minister by the clamours of the people. The minister, when he had laboured in vain to effect an amicable adjustment, yielded to the public importunity, and declared war. About two years afterwards, however, he was constrained to relinquish his power to another statesman, better qualified to give operation to the popular ardour. In the final issue of the contest the primary object of it was apparently abandoned, no stipulation having been formally made in regard to that claim of the right of search, which had been asserted by the Spaniards, and had provoked the resentment of the British. Ten years afterwards even lord Chatham[5], whose patriotic indignation had burned for the insults then offered to his country, acknowledged that time and experience had taught him, that the claim of resisting such a search was one, the concession of which could not be obtained,

[4] This interference occurred both in the West Indies and on the continent of America. Before the *assiento*-treaty, a very advantageous, though contraband trade, was maintained between Jamaica and the Spanish colonies. This traffic was diminished by that treaty, which permitted a direct intercourse subject to certain duties; and it became the interest of Spain, for the sake of the duties, to suppress the clandestine importations of the traders of Jamaica. The right of cutting logwood in the bay of Campeachy, and of collecting salt in the island of Tortuga, was moreover questioned by the Spaniards; and disputes likewise arose conçerning the limits of Carolina and Georgia.—Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. i. pp. 9, 57, 58. [5] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 127, 128.

except from a nation wholly subdued. The court of Spain however, though the claim was not allowed, did make concessions[6], sufficiently justifying the treaty, by which the war was concluded.

In this war the French government, desirous of causing a diversion of the British forces, formed a plan for the invasion of Great Britain, in support of the exiled family of its sovereigns. A storm, by preventing the embarkation of the French army, frustrated that part of it[7], which was truly formidable and left only the unaided and forlorn enterprise of the son of the pretender[8], which in its result was, like the preceding attempt, beneficial to the government. The former had given occasion to the improvement of the government in the southern district of the united kingdom, especially in the enactment of a law for permitting the septennial duration of a parliament; this other rebellion of the Scotish adherents of the Stuarts, which followed at an interval of thirty years, was not less directly instrumental to the extension of order into the remote and less civilised provinces of the north.

When the union of the two crowns had happily terminated the hostilities of the two nations[9], which in a border-strife had cherished a warlike spirit among the lowlanders of Scotland, these lost that superiority in arms, by which they had been enabled to restrain their highland neighbours, who on

[6] The court of Spain agreed to pay a large sum to the South Sea company, to permit the re-establishment of the British trade in Spain, and to require of British subjects only the same duties on merchandise, which should be paid by the subjects of the king of Spain.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. p. 127. [7] 'In the beginning of 1744 transports were collected at Dunkirk for an army of fifteen thousand men under the command of marshal Saxe, who with prince Charles Edward, the pretender's son, arrived at that place on the twenty-third of February; but, while the embarkation of the troops was going on, a storm arose, which wrecked a number of transports, whereby many soldiers and seamen, and a great quantity of warlike stores, were lost, and an end for that time, was put to the invasion. Had this expedition reached the shores of Britain, the whole of the disaffected clans, who were able to bring to the field twelve thousand men, were prepared to rise. The chiefs were all then united, which, for various reasons, they were not, when the rebellion actually took place.'—Mem. of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 by the Chevalier de Johnstone, introd. xxxiv. London, 1822. [8] The son of the pretender was encouraged by the battle of Fontenoy, in which, on the eleventh of May 1745, the British troops were cut to pieces, few regular troops being then in the island.—Ibid. [9] Home's Hist. of the Rebellion, p. 12.

the other hand retained their manners unaltered, and thus became formidable in their turn. The number of the highlanders indeed was not considerable, the force, which they could bring into the field, being estimated only at twelve thousand men; but, being martial by the feudal habits of their tribes, disposed to obedience by the attachments of clanship, and protected by the fastnesses of a mountainous region, they were able to create a long series of alarms among those, who had become unwarlike in the occupations of industry and the tranquillity of order. The insurrection of the year 1745 was the last of their disorders, as it pointed out the necessity of recurring to some effectual measures, for destroying the power of the highland chiefs, the great obstacle opposed to the progress of civilisation.

Advantage was taken of the crisis of their discomfiture, for abolishing the heretable jurisdictions of the chiefs, which in the treaty of union it had been found necessary to reserve, as inviolable rights of property. Without a rebellion, which should demonstrate the mischievous operation of these rights, and at the same time, by its failure, add strength to the government, they must have remained unaltered, and in a corner of the island a political anomaly must have continued to exist, which would have nourished a spirit of disorder and resistance.

Though Sir Robert Walpole had been displaced, and some other changes had been made in the ministry, it was still exclusively composed of Whigs, while the opposition was formed partly of the excluded Whigs, partly of Tories. This new ministry was of very short continuance. Mr. Pulteney, who had flattered himself with the hope, that, while he maintained his consistency by declining an official station, he should yet be able to influence and direct the measures of the government, soon perceived that he had been rendered the instrument of the policy of his predecessor, and had forfeited popularity without acquiring power. The ministry, at the expiration of two years, became divided by the jealousy, which the influence, acquired by lord Carteret with his sovereign, excited in the mind of Mr. Pelham. That nobleman and his friends, in consequence of this division, found it necessary to resign their employments, and a new ministry was formed, of which Mr. Pelham became the chief.

This ministry is memorable, as the first effort of the new dynasty to combine in the public service the two great parties of the state, several Tories being introduced into the vacant places of the government, together with those leaders of the Whigs, who had been before excluded. A coalition of parties was the professed principle of the new arrangement, which was distinguished by the ludicrous name of the *broad-bottomed* ministry. The Tories had then been thirty years proscribed from the royal confidence, in which long interval they had been schooled in the independence of a parliamentary opposition. It was at length seasonable that they should be brought into connexion with the government, which had at that time acquired a sufficiently firm establishment. Their extravagant notions of the royal dignity had been much moderated by their long-continued exclusion from the royal favour; they could not hope to overthrow a government, which so many years of scarcely interrupted tranquillity had rooted in the attachments of the nation; and they must themselves have experienced some influence of habit, in disposing them to adhere to an establishment, to which they had been so long accustomed to submit. In the time of commencing the new arrangement of ministerial power there was a peculiar felicity, for it was begun at the close of the year 1744, just before the last desperate effort to restore the family of the Stuarts to the throne of these countries. The attachment to that family, which long subsisted among the country-gentlemen of England must have been weakened by a conciliatory measure, which had so recently relieved their party from a political[10] proscription.

Among the causes, which contributed to ruin the still subsisting party of the Jacobites, has been mentioned in the preceding edition, the worthlessness of the adventurer, who at this time called upon the people, to hazard their lives in the support of the pretensions of his family. The character of this adventurer, which had been invested with an heroic dignity by the great romance-writer of the age, had since

[10] Lord Mahon has remarked, that the security of the reigning family was in no small degree strengthened by the estrangement between George II. and his son, which began in the year 1737, and from that time gained over the Tories, by presenting a hope of admission to power at the death of the former.—Hist. of England., vol. ii. p. 313. Lond. 1837.

been presented in a very different view by the publication of an original memorial of the time[11]. Lord Mahon[12] has however rejected this representation, as dictated by disappointment and spleen, and confirmed the character given by Sir Walter Scott. Such a character, it may be allowed, was well fitted to maintain the desperate cause of Jacobitism, and the maintenance of this cause, it should be remembered, was the urgent motive for maintaining that friendly connexion with France, which contributed so much to the prosperity of the British empire.

At the appointment of the new ministry, parliamentary opposition seemed almost to expire. The nation had been roused to resentment against France; the heroic fortitude of the queen of Hungary had excited the warmest admiration; and those, who were still adverse to the measures of the court, were forced to abandon the hope of creating any effectual resistance. In the progress of the war new occurrences favoured the popularity of the minister. The suppression of the rebellion, while it drew from the king expressions of gratitude for the affectionate attachment of his subjects, exalted that attachment into an enthusiasm of triumph; and towards the conclusion of the war, the minds of all persons were gratified by some naval successes, which maintained not only the security, but the honour of the nation.

When peace had been restored, the commercial resources of the country manifested an improvement so considerable, that the minister was soon enabled to accomplish a great operation of finance, which in effect took from the public burdens one quarter of their amount. The demand for the public securities had, in consequence of the great accumulation of private capital, risen so much above their nominal value, that the creditors of the public were easily induced to consent to a reduction of interest equivalent to such a diminution of the debt. This indeed appears to have been a period of prosperity, unprecedented in the history of the British government. The fruits of the long and peaceable administration of Walpole had been matured in the industry and the opulence of the nation; the recent war had roused into energy those activities, which must have become lan-

[11] Mem. of the Rebellion by the Chevalier de Johnstone. Lond., 1822. [12] Hist. of England, vol. iii. pp. 279—290.

guid in the tranquillity of protracted peace; and the renewal of tranquillity had afforded an opportunity for directing to the objects of national improvement the national powers, which had thus been alternately cherished in peace, and stimulated in war.

The eminently useful and popular administration of Mr. Pelham was terminated by his death in the year 1754, when it had continued nearly ten years[13]. The time indeed, when such a minister could be useful, had then drawn near to its close. Like Sir Robert Walpole, he was a minister of peace, persuaded that the interest of his country might best be promoted by domestic regulation; but already had those contests begun in America, which soon afterwards involved the British government in a struggle with France, and then, by a necessary consequence, in the great and general struggle of the seven-years' war.

The seven-years' war is an illustrious period in the history of Britain. Though it began the decline of the federal system of Europe, it yet established the greatness of the British power, as if that power was then prepared for those stupendous exertions, which the dissolution of the system would render necessary for maintaining its own independence, and for effecting the subsequent liberation of the continent. In every region of the earth did the force of Great Britain then encounter its adversaries, but more particularly was it distinguished in those colonial and naval conflicts, which peculiarly belonged to the character of the nation. Such indeed was the excitement of the national spirit, that a peace, which fulfilled every reasonable purpose of aggrandisement, and in the extension of the American territory of the empire was eventually even destructive of its former dominion in that continent, was reprobated as dishonourable and criminal, because it did not satisfy the expectations of a people inflamed with the pride of success.

This war was not however splendid in its commencement, the great minister, whose commanding spirit infused a soul into the exertions of his country, not having been at once called into action. An interval of weakness and discom-

[13] With the interruption however of three days in the year 1746. Lord Granville (the same with Lord Carteret) was, on the resignation of Mr. Pelham, named minister to manage a war with France; but after three days the king found it necessary to restore Mr. Pelham.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 105—111.

fiture preceded its glories. The hopes of the nation were overwhelmed by the discovery of the insufficiency of its government[14], and the general voice of an indignant people demanded and obtained the advancement of Mr. Pitt. This distinguished statesman held a subordinate situation in the government, but notwithstanding, just before the commencement of the continental hostilities, went into a qualified opposition[15], on the very popular ground of resisting a war to be undertaken for the defence of Hanover. By this conduct he acquired the confidence of the people, and by their clamorous importunity he was speedily forced into the chief place of the ministry. Then however he engaged in the execution of the very measure, which he had before opposed. His defence was that he found the nation actually engaged in a German war, which it became his duty to conduct to its termination, and that he had repeatedly, though in vain, demanded who they were, that would object to the prosecution of the contest. The unconquerable fortitude of the king of Prussia had, in this war, thrown around him the same brilliancy, with which, in the preceding, the nation had been dazzled by the heroism of the queen of Hungary; and it so happened that the avowed patron of infidelity was regarded by the British public, as the hero of the protestant cause against the overwhelming force of a popish confederacy. The people conceived a yet stronger interest in the struggle, as soon as their pride had begun to receive gratification from the successes of the new minister.

The name of the great statesman, who then animated and directed the energies of the empire, presents itself to our recollection, as that of the war-minister of our history. He found his country disgraced and dispirited, and he raised it to a height of glory, to which it had never reached before. Instead of a divided and desponding nation, he opposed to the enemies of Britain a whole people actuated by a single

[14] The duke of Newcastle, brother of Mr. Pelham, who had been in office from the year 1724, was at the head of this ministry. [15] He continued paymaster of the forces, and in his opposition he was joined by Mr. Fox, afterwards lord Holland, who was then secretary at war. Their opposition is described by earl Waldegrave, as attacking persons, though not things, and on questions of an indifferent nature, where the affairs of government did not appear to be immediately concerned.—Memoirs from 1754 to 1758, p. 31. London, 1821. He was dismissed in the beginning of the following winter.—Ibid., p. 58.

soul, and that his own daring and magnanimous spirit. His plans of action were comprehensive as the globe itself, and their execution seemed to have the certainty and the precision of the visitations of heaven.

Such was the eloquence of this extraordinary man[16], that his contemporaries, who felt his power, have spoken of it in the language of astonishment. Irregular, but possessing in its irregularity the sublimity of nature, it searched the souls of men, and terrified where it failed to convince. The splendid orb, which dazzled an admiring senate, has long since set, and few of the living generation have been witnesses of its glories; but admiration has become eloquent in transmitting its praises, and we may even now form some conception of its lustre from the reflected eloquence, with which it has brightened our history.

Perhaps even this fascinating power did not more contribute to the ascendency, which he obtained over the nation, than the persuasion of his incorruptible integrity. The probation, which he had undergone in a lucrative employment, had afforded him an ample opportunity of manifesting his contempt for sordid considerations[17]; and his renunciation of the favour of his sovereign, when it was proposed to involve the country in the contentions of the continent, had disposed the people to reverence him as the martyr of their interests. Such a character, powerful at all times, must then have been more especially authoritative, when an acknowledged system of corrupt influence had lowered the general estimate of political integrity, and but too much jus-

[16] Various eulogies of this statesman and his eloquence have been annexed to the Anecdotes of his Life. The most remarkable, beginning with the words 'The secretary stood alone,' has been ascribed to Mr. Grattan, the Irish orator. Earl Waldegrave, who probably was not very sensible to eloquence, speaks of Murray, afterwards lord Mansfield, as having 'had greatly the advantage over Pitt in point of argument; and, abuse only excepted, was not much his inferior in any part of oratory.' He elsewhere however says of the latter: 'he is not always a fair or conclusive reasoner, but commands the passions with sovereign authority; and to inflame or captivate a popular assembly is a consummate orator.'—Earl Waldegrave's Mem., p. 15. [17] When he was appointed to the office of paymaster of the forces, he declined to make any private advantage of the public money, as had been customary; and he afterwards refused a customary allowance on the subsidies granted to the king of Sardinia and the queen of Hungary.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 111—113.

tified a belief, that the professions of statesmen were the artifices of dealers in the market of power and emolument.

But neither his eloquence, nor his integrity, would have given him an influence so commanding, as the bold and overpowering energy of a mind, which was formed by nature to sway the counsels of nations. When the favourite of Mary de Medici was tried as a witch for the influence, which she had exercised over that princess[18], her high-spirited answer was, that she had employed no other magic than that, which strong minds practise on the weak. This was the magic of Pitt; but, instead of being practised on a weak individual and a female, it was exercised over the assembled wisdom of a nation and the entire community. In the trying hour of difficulty and danger all shrunk before the legitimate pretensions of his lofty spirit, and the powers of a whole people became concentrated under the influence of one presiding mind.

Though he was forced into the military operations of the continent of Europe, the navy was his favourite instrument of war, and he wielded it in a manner characteristic of his genius. Peremptorily refusing to give his confidence to any secondary authority[19], he sent indeed his instructions to the admiralty, to receive the official signatures, but caused them to be covered, and signed in ignorance of their purport.

But, when we have concurred in the plaudits, which have been bestowed upon him as a war-minister, we may hesitate in bestowing upon him also the title of an enlightened statesman. His soul was fitted to raise the heart of a nation, which had been sunk in the indolence of peace and prosperity, for he was noble in his views, and ardent in the prosecution of his purposes. But to such a character it could scarcely belong, to balance with a cold blooded prudence the various interests of a state, to be decided only by a fair estimate of substantial advantage. We find him accordingly acknowledging the merit of the excise-bill[20], which in the time of Walpole he had strenuously opposed; and his last solemn appeal to those feelings, which he had once so mastered, was a wild and romantic effort to hazard the resources

[18] Meiner's Hist. of the Female Sex, vol. ii. pp. 333, 334. London, 1808. [19] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 172, 173.
[20] Coxe's Mem. of Sir R. Walpole, vol. iii. p. 335.

of the state, of which he at the same time admitted that he was ignorant, in a desperate struggle for re-establishing the authority of Britain over the revolted colonies of America. In the one case he had not allowed himself to regard any other consideration, than that of the personal liberty of individuals: in the other, though he abjured every idea of exacting a revenue from America, he could not bring himself to forego the dominion of his country.

It happened that he was displaced even before the termination of the struggle, which he conducted with so much glory; but the spirit, which he had infused into the public counsels, survived the power of him, from whom it had been derived. The exertions of the government continued to be vigorous and successful; and so mighty was the impulse, which his energy had communicated, that the change of the minister was discoverable only in the disposition to bring the war to a conclusion[21]. For this perhaps the change was indispensable. Such was the magnificence of his ambition, that he could not have stooped to the necessary concessions; such the determination of his character, that he would have disregarded every difficulty in continuing the contest. He reprobated the peace of the year 1763, as inadequate to the successes of his country; and yet the indignation of France, impatient of her humiliation, hurried that government into the war, which afterwards dismembered the empire.

The immediate occasion of the resignation of the minister was the opposition given to his proposal of declaring war against Spain[22], which proposal was founded chiefly on his knowledge of the family-compact, recently concluded between the governments of that country and of France. The remoter cause seems to have been the change of the sovereign. George II. died unexpectedly in the year 1760, and the new reign introduced a new system of administration, both foreign and domestic.

The education of George III., being exclusively British, may seem to have brought him more within the influence of the parties of the state, than his predecessors of the same family. As his father, the prince of Wales, had actually

[21] The new prime minister was the earl of Bute, a favourite of the mother of George III. [22] Annals of Great Britain, vol. i. pp. 29—33. Edinb., 1807.

held a court in opposition to the reigning king, he must at least have been kept at a distance from those who were then in possession of power. This however now appears to have been the extent of the influence. The disposition of his mother seems to have determined him[23], as much as possible to shun the thraldom, in which the two preceding sovereigns of his family had been held by their ministers, and to govern for himself.

The two preceding monarchs[24], being foreigners, and opposed by a native prince, who had numerous adherents even in considerable families, found it expedient to intrust a large portion of their power to a few distinguished houses, that they might more effectually secure their possession of the crown; and they were the more disposed to adopt this policy, as their continental dominions were from early recollection and habit the primary object of their solicitude. Its effect was that they were reduced almost to a state of pupilage by the leaders of the Whigs. This was distinctly experienced in the year 1746[25], when the resignation of the party of Mr. Pelham left George II. in an absolute incapacity of managing the government; and in the year 1763, when a new reign had subsisted three years, Mr. Pitt assured his successor[26], that it could not be maintained without the aid of the great families, who had supported the revolution. The British government appears thus to have, in that period, borne a resemblance to that of Ireland, and in part for a similar reason. The foreign habits of the earlier of the Brunswick princes, and their frequent absences, caused the same kind of dependence upon parliamentary leaders, which was there the result of the frequent and protracted absences of the chief governors. We even find the very same appellation bestowed upon those leaders, which is familiar in the history of the neighbouring island, lord Melcombe[27] having in the year 1760 described the preceding management of the government, by observing that a set of *undertakers* had farmed the power of the crown at a stipulated price, and under that

[23] 'It is well known, that she ever impressed upon the king, from his early years, this lesson,—George, be king.'—Nicholls's Recollections and Reflections, p. 6. Lond., 1820. [24] Adolphus's Hist. of England under George III., vol i. p. 13. Lond., 1805. [25] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. p. 109. [26] Ibid., p. 296.
[27] Adolphus, vol. i. p. 24.

pretence had applied it to the support of their own influence.

That this system of oligarchical administration should be discontinued in each country was certainly an improvement. In Great Britain, while the new dynasty was yet subject to the influence of foreign principles of government, the ascendency of a party pledged to the principles of freedom was favourable to those domestic interests, for the protection of which the new family had been established on the throne. Through two successive reigns the influence of this party had accordingly continued to be paramount, even in respect to the authority of the crown itself. The time however had arrived, when it should be reduced to its just proportion in the state, a third prince, who was a Briton both by birth and education, having succeeded to the royal power.

The immediate agent in this change of the government was the earl of Bute, who just five months after the accession of the new king, was made secretary of state, and in the following year was placed at the head of the ministry. His recommendation could only have been[28], that he had obtained the favour of the princess of Wales, the mother of the king, for he appears to have been destitute of ability, possessing only an imposing exterior[29]. That princess however had earnestly inculcated in the mind of her son the lesson of independent government[30], to which she had been accustomed in the petty court of Saxe Gotha, and the earl of Bute, connected with no party, was, so far as his influence over the mind of the king could extend, a convenient agent of her wishes. The difficulties, which that nobleman encountered, were indeed very great. His country subjected him to the jealousy of national antipathy; his political principles, being adverse to the popular tenets of the Whigs, attracted the most vehement reprobation; his personal connexion with his sovereign provoked the animosity of all,

[28] Earl Waldegrave very plainly intimates, that in this favour there was something not fit to be mentioned. Mem. pp. 51, 53, 67, 77.

[29] 'The late prince of Wales, who was not over nice in the choice of ministers, used frequently to say, that Bute was a fine showy man, who would make an excellent ambassador in a court, where there was no business.—Ibid., p. 38. The earl has particularly mentioned that he had fine legs, and a theatrical air of the greatest importance.

[30] Nicholls's Recollections, pp. 11, 12

who were competitors for the royal confidence ; and his unbending and ungracious manners deprived him of all the attachments of private familiarity, while he was unpractised and incapable in the arts of parliamentary management. So severely did he feel these difficulties, that in the year 1763 he surprised the public by a resignation, occasioned by his consciousness of the embarrassment of his situation. But it may well be questioned, whether he was not, for the well-being of the government, the very fittest person to give a beginning to a new system of administration. Unconnected as he was, and even on account of his country an object of jealousy, he was not led to substitute one party for another, and merely to make a change of persons, instead of introducing a change in the general management of the public business. Unacquainted with the arts, and destitute of the powers, by which popularity is acquired, he was unable to procure for that change a reception so favourable, as might have too much augmented the influence of the crown, and too much discredited a respectable and useful party. He was able to assist his sovereign in becoming sufficiently independent of those, who had previously parcelled out the power of the crown, but he was not qualified either to surround him with a new set of undertakers of the government, or to invest him with an authority, which should overbear opposition.

How long the influence of lord Bute continued to be exercised on the mind of the sovereign, is an historical problem, which cannot be solved with precision. That it did not cease to operate at the time of his resignation is certain, since it is known that he was the agent of some subsequent changes. Lord Chatham has described it as having continued long after this event, even beyond the termination of his own ministerial career, saying in the year 1770, with the splendid exaggeration of that eloquence which was familiar to him[31], that he saw something behind the throne, which was greater than the king himself. Lord Bute[32] has on the

[31] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. ii. p. 46. Confidential communications were conveyed from the king to the princess dowager and the earl of Bute by Mr. Charles Jenkinson, whom he had found a clerk, when he was made secretary of state.—Nicholls's Recol. p. 12.
[32] Ibid., p. 380.

other hand expressly declared, that he had no concern with the government after the year 1765; and Mr. Adolphus[33] has assured us, on the authority of private information, that he was constantly complaining of the neglect of his sovereign. However this may have been, the system of government, which had been established by him, continued to exist. The king ceased to be told, that he must delegate his powers to the chiefs of certain families, without whose co-operation they could not be effectually exercised; and it became necessary for those, who would render themselves necessary to their sovereign, that they should found their importance rather on the confidence of the people, than on the connexions and strength of a party.

If, under this new system, the ministerial party were brought to maintain high notions of prerogative, and to describe themselves as the friends of the king, the Whigs were on the other hand brought to embrace yet larger notions of liberty, and to present themselves as the zealous advocates of popular pretensions. During their long enjoyment of power they had frequently supported measures favourable to the augmentation of the royal authority. From this time they contracted the habits of an opposition. They accordingly found it necessary to conciliate the people by advocating the most liberal principles, so that the difference, which Mr. Burke has so strongly contended to have existed between the Whigs of his time and those of the revolution, may in its origin be referred to the altered position of the party in the commencement of the reign of George III. The great struggle of the parliament in this manner changed its character. Instead of being a mere contest of the two parties of Whigs and Tories, it became a contest of the authority of the crown and of a popular opposition. The king ceased to be in a state of pupilage, and the people acquired importance; and the scaffolding of parties, necessary for building up the constitution, having been at length removed, the structure exhibited without obstruction the grandeur of its proportions.

In one important particular indeed a practice was even then introduced, which is, it must be acknowledged, of a

[33] Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 110. Probably the king had discovered his incapacity and want of courage.—Nicholls's Recollections, p. 13.

very equivocal character, and in the opinion of the reformers of the present day destructive of the essential principles of the constitution. The smaller boroughs[34], which had been from the earliest time under the command of the neighbouring peers and gentlemen, or of the crown, were observed, in the general elections of the years 1747 and 1754, to have yielded their representation to persons recommended only by their wealth, and about the commencement of the reign of George III. the sale of seats in parliament is mentioned, as of any other transferable property. This practice no man can reconcile to any theory of the constitution; but it has been very forcibly argued that the constitution is a practical, not a theoretical form of government, and that in a nation, in which great pecuniary interests and colonial establishments require the protection of the legislature, it is essentially important that such openings should exist, through which these may procure the advantage of an indirect representation. The time seems to have passed by, when it was sufficient that the land and the towns of Great Britain should be represented in the parliament. Trade had accumulated money in the possession of individuals little connected with local interests, and the power of the country had begun to be extended over great foreign dependencies. The government had thus become a most complex machine of political superintendence, embracing concerns of the most various natures, and requiring to its due adjustment, that it should be furnished with new movements; and it seems that, by an anomaly not defensible in theory, the same interests, which had begun to require a portion of legislative protection, had provided that new influence of wealth, which found its way into the boroughs before influenced only by the crown, or by the territorial aristocracy.

The period of time comprehended within this chapter was distinguished by the commencement of the English novel, which[35] has been by Sir Walter Scott, the most eminent in this department of literature, referred to the publi-

[34] Hallam, Constit. Hist., vol. iii. p. 402. Lord Mahon however has cited authorities to prove, that more than thirty years before the practice was not unknown.—Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 66. [35] Life of Fielding in Biograph. Mem. of Eminent Novelists, vol. i. p. 103. Edinb., 1834.

cation of the *History of a Foundling* (in the year 1750) by Fielding. Even Richardson's novels, he has remarked, are but a step from the old romance, approaching indeed more nearly to the ordinary course of events, but still dealing in improbable incidents, and in characters swelled out beyond the ordinary limits of humanity. The *History of a Foundling*, he adds, is truth and human nature itself, and there lies the inestimable advantage which it possesses over all previous fictions of this particular kind. In conformity to these observations lord Byron[36] has characterised this writer as the *prose* Homer of human nature.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the history of Great Britain, from the commencement of the administration of Mr. Grenville in the year 1763 *to the end of the American war in the year* 1783.

The sovereignty of Bengal acquired by the East India company in the year 1765—The American war begun, 1775—The colonies of North America independent, 1783.

THE third sovereign of the Hanoverian family was peculiarly qualified for the task of delivering the crown from the restraint, in which it had been held by the oligarchy of the Whigs. Having been born and educated in England, he was not bound to the former dominions of his family by those ties of habitual attachment, which had so frequently drawn his predecessors to absent themselves from their acquired kingdom. Irreproachable in his private conduct, he exhibited the rare example of a young prince, to whom all the violence of opposition could object only his personal partiality to one individual, the agent of his mother in the plan of rendering him independent of his ministers. Unalterably firm in his purposes[1], he supported the ministers

[36] Life of Fielding in Biograph. Mem. of Eminent Novelists, vol. i. p. 116, note. [1] In his youth this firmness was remarked as obstinacy. Mem. by Earl Waldegrave, p. 8.

of his choice, until the necessity of yielding to their adversaries had become unequivocal.

George III. at his accession had two objects[2]; to free himself from the control of the Whigs, and to put an end to the war. The latter object was attained by the peace of Paris concluded in the year 1763[3], which became the epoch of the greatest prosperity enjoyed by the British empire. The commerce of England was extended through every region of the globe, and was protected by a naval force no longer balanced by the French navy, which had been destroyed in the preceding war. The territories ceded in America and in Africa opened new fields of industrious exertion, which were diligently cultivated; and it happened that about the same time the foundation was laid of that Indian empire, which has since extended its sway over the whole peninsula.

The dominion of the Grand Mogul having been reduced almost to the possession of Delhi, the former capital, the French and English long contended in India, as the auxiliaries of the governors, then enjoying independent power, until in a war, begun in the year 1755 the latter acquired a decisive ascendency over their rivals[4]. This success was followed by the commencement of the Indian empire of Great Britain, the Indian viceroy of Bengal, who at the instigation of the French had seized the British factory of Calcutta, and treated the garrison with extreme cruelty, having been deprived of his government, the royalty of which was, in the year 1765, procured from the Mogul emperor, in return for British protection and an annual pension.

The treaty, which confirmed all this prosperity, bestowed upon Great Britain some additional settlements, the acquisition of which has since proved to have entailed upon these countries, and upon the world, the most important conse-

[2] Nicholls's Recollections, p. 12. [3] Tableau de Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 366. [4] Ibid., tome ii. p. 368. By the treaty of the year 1765 the British took possession of the kingdoms of Bengal, Bahar and Orixa. This dominion was extended by acquisitions made in wars waged against the sultan Hyder-Aly and his successor Tippoo Saib, the most considerable of which was the state of Mysore. Seringapatam, the capital of the latter province, was taken in the year 1799. Ibid.

quences. The French[5] by that treaty ceded to Great Britain Nova Scotia and Canada with all their dependencies, thus abandoning the positions, from which they had previously menaced the British settlements. This was hailed as an acquisition very favourable to the security of those settlements, but for that very reason it was the remote cause of the independence, which they achieved for themselves at the expiration of twenty years. No longer dependent on the mother-country for protection against hostile neighbours, the colonists ceased to value their connexion with it, and were predisposed to maintain their local interests against it, whenever these should be found to clash with the demands of the British government. In this acquisition accordingly we perceive the principle of the independence of the American states, which in its turn held out to France the signal of revolution, a signal answered at the brief interval of six years more. A revolution of a different kind had been previously begun in the government of the mother-country by the same example of independence, as it encouraged and enabled the people of Ireland to claim from the common government that freedom of commerce and constitution, which eventually generated the incorporate union of the two kingdoms; and thus completed the consolidation of the empire. Nor was this the only influence exercised upon the government of the mother-country by the acquisition of Canada, for it created the original precedent, which in the year 1829 has been amply followed in the admission of Roman Catholics into the parliament of the united kingdom, and had indeed been often pleaded in recommendation of that measure. In the treaty it had been stipulated, that the people of Canada should enjoy the freedom of the Roman Catholic religion, so far as was permitted by the laws of England. The stipulation, in the heedlessness of regulating the concerns of a distant and obscure settlement, was understood to guarantee to them an

[5] Spain by the same treaty ceded to Great Britain Florida and all her possessions on the continent of North America to the east and south-east of the Mississippi, Louisiana and New Orleans having been ceded by France to Spain, in compensation of this cession. Louisiana was in the year 1801 restored by Spain to France, which again ceded it to the United States in the year 1803. Ibid., p. 365, note.

unrestrained establishment of the existing church; and accordingly the oath of supremacy was repealed for Canada, an oath of allegiance being alone required. Lord Chatham contended in vain[6], that the act of Elizabeth, by which that oath had been established, had always been considered as one, which the legislature had no more right to repeal, than the great charter or the bill of rights.

When the sovereign had begun to put an end to the pupilage of the crown, the house of commons was placed in new and different circumstances, and assumed a new character. From this time, instead of being actuated chiefly by the influence of certain powerful, but popular families, it appeared to be composed of four distinct parties, brought together into one general assembly for their mutual control. The crown had from this time its party among the representatives of the nation[7]; the aristocratical leaders retained among them the influence inseparable from rank and property; the popular interest, in the fortunate diversity of the constituency, had members also to advocate its claims; and by the recent introduction of the influence of money, in procuring admission into the lower chamber of the legislature, the pecuniary and colonial concerns of the empire experienced the necessary protection. The house of commons thus became a great and general council, embracing all the orders of the state, though nominally representing only the landed proprietors among the commons and the towns.

In this change of circumstances it became necessary that some new principles should be established for the due regulation of the government; and it happened at the same time, that an individual stood forward, peculiarly qualified to be the innoxious instrument for determining the yet unsettled questions of the constitution. John Wilkes, the author of a periodical publication named the North Briton[8], avowed his resolution of trying, how far it was practicable

[6] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. ii. p. 114. [7] About thirty persons assumed the appellation of the king's friends, affecting to belong to no minister, to maintain no connexion, to court no interest, to embrace no principle, to hold no opinion.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. p. 321. A disavowal so comprehensive was not unnatural in this, which may be described as a *transition-state* of the house of commons. [8] Adolphus, vol. i. p. 114.

to carry the license of writing on political subjects. The boldness of this demagogue was sufficient for the enterprise; his abilities, though by no means of the first order, were above mediocrity, and such as enabled him to attract popular attention; and his morals were so vicious[9], that those members of the legislature, who protected him as a martyr of the constitution, found it necessary to separate their defence from all consideration of his personal conduct. Such being the instrument, the questions of the constitution were brought into discussion as abstract cases requiring a determination. Rejected with abhorrence by every virtuous mind, the author of the North Briton was supported only as he had made himself the subject of important struggles. Even the populace[10], gratified as they were by the factiousness of his conduct, were disgusted by the profaneness of one of his productions; and, when the struggles of the constitution had been terminated, he speedily sunk into an unimportance, which disabled him for disturbing the public tranquillity.

In the prosecution of his plan of licentious writing[11], he accused his sovereign of uttering a falsehood from the throne. The publication, in which he had proceeded to this extremity, was deemed to demand a legal prosecution of the writer; and a warrant for apprehending him was accordingly issued by the secretary of state. The form of this warrant became the subject of vehement discussion, because, instead of designating the individual to be apprehended under its authority, it authorised a general search for the authors, printers, and publishers of the obnoxious production. The question concerning the validity of such a warrant was not indeed on this occasion formally decided, because Wilkes, who had been apprehended under it, was discharged on account of the privilege[12], which he enjoyed as a member of the house of commons[13], but the illegality

[9] Adolphus, vol. i. p. 125. [10] Annals of George III., vol. i. p. 100. [11] The example was followed by the marquess of Rockingham in parliament in the year 1781.—Adolphus, vol. iii. p. 381.

[12] The privilege of parliament, it was pronounced by chief-justice Pratt, could be forfeited only by treason, felony, or actual breach of the peace.—Annals of George III. vol. i. p. 93.

[13] 'A practice had obtained in the secretary's office ever since the

of general warrants was nevertheless so effectually established by the discussion of it, that from this very time it became an acknowledged principle.

The essay, which subjected Wilkes to this proceeding, had been published after the close of the session in the year 1763, on which account it could not be immediately noticed by the parliament. This circumstance had afforded the occasion for that interposition of the crown, which eventually put an end to the practice of issuing general warrants. The libel having in the following session been taken into consideration by the house of commons, Wilkes was expelled. This measure gave occasion to the memorable struggle between that house and the electors of Middlesex, which served to fix the limit of the power of the representative body in regard to the constituency.

Wilkes having, soon after his expulsion, been outlawed in consequence of a legal prosecution, the proceeding of the house of commons, in expelling him, remained unnoticed until the general election, which was held four years afterwards. He was then returned to parliament for the county of Middlesex, having before represented the borough of Aylesbury. His case being brought under the consideration of the house of commons by an adverse petition, reciting all the proceedings which had been instituted against him, he was again expelled, and declared incapable of serving in that parliament. From this time he began to be regarded as a persecuted man. He was accordingly again returned by the electors of Middlesex; and, having been rejected, he was returned yet a third time, to encounter another rejection.

restoration, grounded on some clauses in the acts for regulating the press, of issuing general warrants to take up (without naming any person in particular) the authors, printers, and publishers of such obscene or seditious libels, as were particularly specified in the warrant. When these acts expired in the year 1694, the same practice was inadvertently continued, in every reign and under every administration, except the four last years of queen Anne, down to the year 1763; when such a warrant being issued, to apprehend the authors, printers, and publishers of a certain seditious libel, its validity was disputed, and the warrant was adjudged by the whole court of king's bench to be illegal in the case of Money v. Leach.'—Trin. 5. Geo. III. B. R. After which the issuing of such general warrants was declared illegal by the house of commons.—Blackstone's Comm. book iv. ch. 11, note.

It was an acknowledged principle of the constitution, that the house of commons alone is competent to exercise a judicial authority, in determining the validity of the elections of its own members. It was admitted also that cases had occurred, which furnished precedents for establishing the rule, that a member, who had been expelled, could not afterwards sit in the same parliament. These precedents however were liable to much objection[14], having mostly occurred in the interruption of regular government, which had intervened between the years 1642 and 1660, and no new writs having been in these cases issued for electing other persons. But, whatever might have been the practice, it was important that a house of commons should be experimentally taught to shun the mischief of committing itself in direct hostility with the constituent body, from which it derives both its existence and its importance. This lesson was strongly inculcated in the case of Wilkes; and so deeply was the lesson impressed, that it appears, after the lapse of forty years, to have determined the house to have recourse to a different expedient, for repressing the violence of a more considerable demagogue, Sir Francis Burdett[15], who was accordingly committed to the Tower.

Wilkes was about two years afterwards concerned in yet another struggle, which greatly augmented the influence of the people over their representatives, as it gave occasion to the unrestrained publication of the debates in parliament, and by the necessary operation of such a freedom has converted the entire community into one deliberative body, of which the parliament may be considered as two standing

[14] Annals of George III., vol. i. p. 202.

[15] This gentleman was committed to the Tower for addressing a letter, in Cobbett's weekly Political Register, to his constituents, in which he had animadverted on the conduct of the house for having committed to Newgate John Gale Jones, who had presided in a debating society, by the authority of which a placard was published, censuring the conduct of Mr. Yorke and Mr. Windham in the house of commons, as hostile to the liberty of the press. Sir F. Burdett brought an action at law against the speaker, the sergeant at arms, and the governor of the Tower; but the court of king's-bench declared, that the privileges of parliament were not cognisable by a court of law, but were a part of the law of the land, so that the right of imprisoning its own members was confirmed to the house. He accordingly remained in confinement to the next prorogation.

committees, debating in the presence of an attentive nation for its information and approval[16]. The publishers of newspapers, who during the utmost violence of the opposition directed against Sir Robert Walpole, had ventured only in the intervals of the sessions to communicate to the public the transactions or speeches of the parliament, and even then with considerable reserve, had since indulged themselves in a practice of detailing from day to day the debates of both houses. For the alleged abuse of this practice they had frequently been summoned to appear, and had been fined, or reprimanded, according to the circumstances of each case. But in the year 1771 the time had arrived, when the public would not be any longer excluded from an entire acquaintance with the proceedings of the legislature.

A member of the house of commons having, in that year, called on the house to exercise its privilege for his protection, measures were adopted for apprehending some printers. These however were speedily discharged from the arrest by Wilkes, then an alderman of London, and by the lord mayor and another alderman. In the progress of the contention the other magistrates, who were also members of the house, were committed to the Tower. Wilkes refused to attend, except in his place, as a representative of Middlesex; and the house could not find a better expedient for extricating itself from the embarrassment caused by his refusal, than that of summoning him for a particular day, and adjourning itself to the day following. Here ended the contest, and with it ended practically the privilege, which would maintain the privacy of the legislature against the curiosity of the public. From this time the whole people became a general assembly, receiving from the parliament the influences of exercised talent, and reciprocally communicating to it that of the public opinion, which its discussions had informed. The imperfection of representative government was thus remedied by a rapid and universal diffusion of intelligence, which connected it immediately with the nation; and a political vitality, uniting the activity of every part of the whole people with the important functions of the legislature, was extended through every order of the community.

The improvement of the parliament, which was at this

[16] Adolphus, vol. i. p. 447.

time effected, was not limited to the operation of popular struggles. The increasing importance of the house of commons having pointed out the necessity of correcting the abuses, which occurred in the determination of contested elections, the first of the statutes, which have been enacted for this purpose, was in the year 1770 introduced by Mr. Grenville. The decisions on petitions relative to contested elections had been made by the whole house, instead of being referred to committees; the influence of party, or of personal attachment, had been observed to prevail on these general discussions to a very mischievous degree, the judges not being bound by any oath, or other special engagement; and the rights of electors, together with those of the objects of their choice, were so grossly violated, that the constitution of the house of commons seemed to be corrupted in its very formation.

The efficacy of the new regulation was very remarkably evinced in the immediately succeeding year, by establishing the original precedent of that gradual reform of parliament, which has since been practised in four successive instances[17]. The borough of New Shoreham was discovered to have been rendered, by a combination of a majority of its freemen, a scene of the most methodical corruption; and, as it might have been difficult to effect a legal conviction of the offending individuals, it was determined to disfranchise a certain number of the more notorious, and to open the borough to the freeholders of an adjacent district.

The author of this valuable law had however, when a minister, been distinguished by originating a measure, which, though beneficial to the empire in its remoter consequences, could not justify any claim to the character of wisdom, having been in its immediate influence a principle of alienation, civil war, and national degradation. He was indeed fitted by his previous habits for adjusting the details of a regulation[18], not for devising the measures of a comprehensive policy; and the narrow accuracy of his views has been hap-

[17] The boroughs of Cricklade, Aylesbury, Grampound, and very recently Newark. [18] Mr. Burke, in his speech on the question of taxing the American colonies, described him as formed to such a character, first in the study of the law, and then in the business of office.

pily characterised by doctor Johnson in remarking[19], that he possessed talents not universally afforded to mankind, for, had he gotten the Manilla-ransom[20], he could have counted it. In the year 1763, when lord Bute found it necessary to resign his official station, Mr. Grenville, who had held under him the office of secretary of state, was advanced to the treasury. Lord Bute had just concluded the seven-years' war. Mr. Grenville in the following year[21] proposed to recruit the exhausted finances of the nation by imposing direct taxes upon the American settlements.

From the revolution, which had first adjusted the balance of the constitution, the government had advanced in an uninterrupted course of improvement and prosperity. By the Scotish union had been for ever terminated the dissensions of a jealous vicinage, and to the whole island had been given the strength and the dignity of one comprehensive sovereignty: by the introduction of the family of Hanover under the authority of the parliament, the controlling superintendence of the parliament had been fully established, and the principles of the revolution confirmed: by the pacific administrations of Walpole and Pelham the resources of the state had been fostered and improved, and the materials of its future greatness amply prepared: and, lastly, by the energetic rule of the elder Pitt the government had assumed an exalted station in the general order of the world, and triumph had become so familiar, that the people could scarcely be reconciled to the advantages of a reasonable peace. At such a time it was, that the question of American taxation began to be agitated. From that moment the empire began to descend from its proud eminence. A period of irritation and discontent was succeeded by the calamity of civil war, and the dismemberment of thirteen pro-

[19] Life of Mr. Fox by Fell, vol. i. p. 46. [20] The city of Manilla in the Philippine islands having been taken by the British in the year 1762, it was agreed that it should be ransomed; but the ransom was never paid. —Pinkerton's Mod. Geogr., vol, ii. p. 453. [21] Mr. Nicholls, though he confesses that he had no direct knowledge on the subject, concluded from circumstances, that this was the measure of the king, rather than of the minister.—Recollections, &c., pp. 15, 386—388. Mr. Jenkinson, afterwards lord Hawkesbury, declared in the house of commons, in the year 1777, that the measure had not been originated by Mr. Grenville.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. p. 315, note.

vinces seemed to prognosticate inevitable ruin. *But yesterday*, said lord Chatham, borrowing the language of the dramatic poet, *and England might have stood against the world: now none so poor, to do her reverence.*

He who had with the most successful vigour exerted the energies of the government, pronounced America to be 'the fountain of our wealth, the nerve of our strength, and the nursery and basis of our naval power[22].' This important member it was forced to throw off from the trunk of the empire, and it was yet to be determined, whether that trunk could continue to flourish after so great a mutilation. We however know, that the commercial resources and the power of our country did actually recover from the grievous depression. We know that her power, far from sinking in decay, attained to unexampled prosperity; that her empire has in another region much more than compensated the loss of territory in America; and that her naval armaments, unlike to the indecisive efforts of preceding times, have annihilated the maritime resistance of the world. Ten years had scarcely elapsed from the conclusion of the struggle, when the powers of the same government were found to be capable of sustaining a conflict, such as the world had never witnessed.

When we consider how fatally the efforts of the government must have been embarrassed in the stupendous conflict of the war of the French revolution, if the American struggle had been postponed to that period of extreme difficulty, we must regard the previous separation of the American states as a necessary preparation for the struggle, which succeeded. It was also an important preparation, as it eventually augmented, instead of diminishing, the commercial resources of the British empire. America had indeed been a fountain of wealth, and a nursery of naval power; but even before it was effected, dean Tucker[23] had perceived, that it would prove beneficial to the mother-country. Experience has confirmed the sagacious observation, for in the great increase of American prosperity, which has resulted from the independence of the colonies, the trade of Great Britain found a vastly multiplied advantage, so that, when the contest was begun with revolutionary France, Great

[22] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. ii. p. 151. [23] Ibid., p. 128.

Britain had not only been freed from the embarrassments of that other struggle, but was actually strengthened for this new trial of her power.

Though the separation of the American states was favourable to the interests both of the colonies and of the mother-country, and may be considered as a result, which would necessarily arise out of their relative situation, it does not appear that the time had arrived, at which it would be natural and unavoidable. So early indeed as in the year 1754[24], some few more enterprising spirits had indulged themselves in the contemplation of such a revolution; but even twenty years afterwards this was far from being the prevailing sentiment of the colonies, and the declaration of independence, when it was at length adopted, was carried by the smallest imaginable majority of the congress, the majority formed by a single individual in a single state. A revolution commenced with so much hesitation, cannot be regarded as the merely natural result of the operation of general causes, however it may have been finally inevitable in the progress of events. The birth, for which the throes of nature were yet so feeble, must have been hastened by the rashness of empiricism. True wisdom indeed would have dictated a spontaneous and peaceable renunciation of the dominion of the mother-country, as most favourable to its interest; but our nature should have been formed of other elements, to authorise an expectation, that dominion could be so quietly relinquished. The violence however, with which it was accompanied, was probably necessary to the consolidation of the new-formed government; the anticipation of the regular order of events was certainly beneficial to the mother-country, soon to be engaged in the grand struggle with revolutionary France.

The claim of a direct revenue from a country already tributary by the double monopoly of its import and export trade, was itself an instance of political empiricism, venturing upon a bold and dangerous operation, in ignorance, or disregard, of the condition of the patient. The claim was rendered more grievous by measures employed to enforce a restriction of the trade of the colonies[25], the resources being

[24] Adolphus, vol. i. p. 147.

[25] Armed cutters were fitted out for suppressing the trade with the Spanish colonies and with the French West-Indies.—Annals of George III., vol. i. pp. 118, 119.

thus obstructed, from which the proposed revenue might have been supplied. A stamp-tax was then announced; but the imposition was delayed for a year, that the colonies might have sufficient time, for offering some equivalent in its place.

Almost immediately after this decisive measure had been adopted, the ministry was changed, a new ministry being formed of the leaders of the Whigs, at the head of which was placed the marquess of Rockingham. The king, it appears, had been displeased with Mr. Grenville[26], for having declined to propose a bill to enable him to nominate a regent by his will, without so limiting the power as to exclude his mother the princess dowager of Wales. The administration was thus again committed to the Whigs, but for a short time only, the marquess of Rockingham being dismissed after a year and a few days of power. The new ministry, after a long hesitation, repealed the stamp-act, but qualified the repeal with a useless declaration of the right, which they were abandoning in practice.

This ministry was dismissed, probably because the plan of taxing the American colonies was relinquished[27], though the right was maintained. The care of forming a new one was then committed to Mr. Pitt. No attempt of this sort has ever been equally unfortunate. The great commoner by accepting a peerage lost much of his popularity; by a want of the discretion of ordinary minds he was incapable of securing the necessary support[28]; and latterly he was by

[26] The king having been ill in the beginning of the year 1765, it was deemed necessary to provide for the necessity of a regency, the heir apparent being then only two years and a half old. Mr. Grenville suggested that the power of appointment must be limited to the queen and the descendants of George II., declaring that he could not otherwise undertake to carry the bill through the house of commons. This having been communicated by the king to the earl of Northington, then chancellor, the latter undertook to remove the limitation, and for this purpose caused it to be abruptly proposed, that the name of the princess dowager of Wales should be inserted. The house and ministry were taken by surprise, the name was inserted, and Mr. Grenville was dismissed.—Nicholls's Recollections, pp. 15—19. The operation of this transaction was, that it brought in a whig ministry, which encouraged the colonies by repealing the stamp-act. [27] Ibid., p. 22.

[28] Mr. Burke remarked, in a pamphlet subsequently published, that, when Mr. Pitt had formed his cabinet, he was no longer minister.—

ill health altogether disqualified for affording to the transaction of business the necessary attention. Towards the close of this short and ill-arranged ministry[29], even while the name of Chatham continued to adorn the cabinet, the exploded scheme of American taxation was revived[30], though under another form, the imposition being at this time transferred to the commercial customs, but with the purpose of raising a revenue, not merely of regulating trade[31]. At length the earl of Chatham sullenly renounced a station, in which he had already ceased to act, and after little more than a year of a violent administration, conducted by the duke of Grafton[32], who had by the earl been made first lord of the treasury, began that of lord North.

The administration of lord North was begun in the year 1770, and ended in the year 1782, having continued during twelve years. This, which was the first permanent ministry of George III.[33], matured into the independence of the American colonies the rashness and the fluctuation of the ten preceding years. Such had been in these ten years the instability of the government, that the ministry of lord

Ibid., p. 24. Mr. Nicholls says, that he admitted into his cabinet so many persons not sincerely attached to him, or to his measures, that whenever ill health compelled him to absent himself, measures were adopted wholly repugnant to his views.—Nicholls's Recollections, p. 25. [29] It was begun in the year 1766, and ended by the resignation of the earl of Chatham in the year 1768. [30] This was done by Mr. Charles Townshend, probably because he saw that the greatness of the earl of Chatham was declining, and knew that the measure would recommend him to the king. Mr. Burke, in a speech, described him as a prodigy of genius. He was indisputably the first speaker in the house of commons.—Ibid., pp. 26, 27. Death in the year 1767, frustrated his ambition, when he was to have been appointed prime minister.—Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 394, 395. [31] Annals of George III., vol. i. p. 175. [32] He was drawn from his connexion with the earl of Chatham by a curious intrigue. The opponents of the earl, having failed to corrupt his mistress, contrived to effect a marriage for him with the niece of the duchess of Bedford.—Nicholls's Recollections, pp. 27, 28. [33] The king, having acceded to the crown in the month of October in the year 1760, appointed lord Bute secretary of state in the following February, and after a year prime minister. Lord Bute in the year 1763 was succeeded by Mr. Grenville; Mr. Grenville by the marquess of Rockingham in the year 1765; the marquess by the earl of Chatham in the year 1766; the earl of Chatham in the year 1768 was succeeded by the duke of Grafton; and the duke by lord North in the year 1770.

North was the sixth from their commencement. This extraordinary frequency of change, while it proved the difficulty of the struggle, served to facilitate the success of the sovereign, as it broke the connexions of the aristocracy, and presented an opportunity of selecting individuals, who had thus been detached from their original parties. The result was accordingly an administration of long continuance at the head of which was lord North, whose early connexion with the sovereign points him out as the object of a free nomination [34]. Nor does it seem probable, that this administration would have been superseded, even at the expiration of twelve years, if the discontent excited by a disastrous war had not imperatively demanded another choice of ministers.

The American war, which was begun in the year 1775, was concluded in the year 1783, with the acknowledgment of the independence of the United States. Perhaps a war strictly naval might have subdued them. Perhaps too a land-war, prosecuted with a bolder spirit of enterprise, might have crushed their efforts. But the success of Great Britain in the contest could only have postponed an inevitable event, and prepared a future struggle. Indeed even at a late period of the war the reduction of the colonies seems to have been still within the power of Britain, for, before a resolution against the further prosecution of offensive measures was adopted by the house of commons [35], the French minister had declared to the commissioners of America, that France was incapable of affording any further assistance. Fortunately for the interest both of the mother-country and of the colonies, the pride of dominion was just then abandoned, and the efforts of the government were directed to the substitution of an amicable alliance in the place of a dependence no longer beneficial to either party.

In the last year of the war, the ill success, with which it had been conducted, drove lord North from the helm, and

[34] The earl of Guildford, his father, had been tutor to George III., and lord North had performed the part of Syphax in the tragedy of Cato at Leicester-house, when the young prince performed that of Portius.—View of the Hist. of Great Britain during the Administration of Lord North, p. 6, note. Dubl., 1782. [35] Knox's Extra-Official State Papers, pp. 27, 28. Lond., 1789.

placed the opposition party in the possession of ministerial power. The new ministry immediately began to negotiate a peace, which was facilitated by the splendid advantages at length crowning the British arms in almost every region of the earth. In the east the exertions of France were rendered wholly unavailing; in Europe the united efforts of France and Spain were confounded by the memorable defence of Gibraltar; and in the West Indies lord Rodney successfully adopted for the first time the decisive manœuvre which has since acquired for these countries the dominion of the seas. The original object of the war was lost; but the British empire, though dismembered was not dishonoured. Summoning all its energies to resist a combination of enemies, which hoped to profit by its distress, it defied and baffled their united efforts; and while the French monarchy was by this very war involved in financial difficulty, which hastened its subversion, and Spain was reduced to depend for its chief support on the voluntary contributions of individuals[36], the British government even discharged with a punctilious fidelity its debt of honourable obligation to the loyalists of the territory[37], which it was necessitated to relinquish.

That the separation of the American provinces, though it wounded the pride of the British empire, was yet so far from being detrimental to its interests, that a wise policy would even have suggested the measure, had been declared by dean Tucker before the commencement of the struggle. At its termination lord Sheffield illustrated the same principle by a particular detail, and it has recently been confirmed by the testimony, which Talleyrand has borne to the powerful operation of the causes still binding America in commercial connexion with the parent-state. The positive detriment, which appears to have resulted to our government, was the accu-

[36] Adolphus, vol. iii. p. 456. [37] Claims were received from about three thousand heads of families, for losses of property, or of income arising from offices, professions, and trade. The amount of the first species of claims exceeded ten millions sterling, from which, when they exceeded ten thousand pounds, a small deduction was made, and a greater as they were larger, one claimant however receiving a hundred thousand pounds. The amount of the second was a hundred and fifty thousand pounds, of which a hundred and twenty thousand were allowed.—Ibid., pp. 529, 530.

mulation of a debt of nearly a hundred and sixteen millions. But of a government so various in its structure as that of Great Britain, who can say that this additional pressure may not have become necessary to the combination of its parts? The existence of some public debt appears to have been required for establishing a connexion between the monied interest of a great commercial state and the governing part of our mixed and balanced constitution; and we know that the government, though loaded with this additional incumbrance, did actually continue to discharge its functions with efficacy, and has since exerted a vigour, which has far exceeded all its former efforts.

The ministry, by which the war was conducted, owed probably much of its permanency to the popularity of a struggle for the rights of dominion and taxation. Acceptable to the people, as it at once indulged the love of rule, and promised an alleviation of the public burdens, it seems to have long given stability to the minister, by whom it had been undertaken, and was maintained, though, when the contest at length became hopeless, the same war was the occasion of his fall. So far therefore as the long continuance of the administration of lord North was connected with the emancipation of the sovereign from the control of the whig aristocracy, may we regard the revolutionary war of America as instrumental to this interior improvement of the government.

The same war appears also to have completed that important change in the character of the Whigs, by which Mr. Burke has shown that, in the time of the French revolution, they widely differed from those of the revolution of England. The ascendency of lord Bute had predisposed the party to this change by throwing it into opposition, where it acquired the habit of seeking popularity in resisting the measures of the government. The war of America gradually led it onward to the adoption of speculative principles the most independent. The English Whigs thus abandoned the caution, with which their predecessors had carefully moderated their most strenuous measures; and their appeal was at length openly and boldly made to the abstract rights of nature, instead of being anxiously restricted within the conventional rights of a political society.

It is a curious circumstance, that the administration of lord North should not only have given occasion to this decisive change of the principles of the Whigs, but should also have supplied them with the leader, who pushed their new tenets to their utmost extremity. Mr. Fox began his public life with the ministry of that statesman as a lord of the admiralty, in which secondary character he continued during four years to give his support to the government. Dismissed with some circumstances of slight, he joined the opposition, and in the debate on the bill for shutting the port of Boston, he first manifested those powerful energies of mind, which soon constituted him the parliamentary leader of the modern Whigs. Having gone over to that party from their political adversaries he was captivated by the new maxims of independence, which the philosophic fancy of Burke arrayed in additional attractions. His own generous and ardent nature was well adapted to receive, without any cautious hesitation, the doctrines of freedom.

Mr. Burke had become connected with the Whigs in the brief administration of the marquess of Rockingham, having been selected to be the private secretary of that nobleman[37], who was little conversant with public business. To this office he brought a most cultivated mind, and a boundless extent of information; in it he seems to have acquired that disposition to conduct a government by the connexions of parliamentary parties, which ultimately, on the grand question of revolution, placed him in opposition to Mr. Fox, and gave occasion to a secession of the great leaders of the Whigs. This difference of the views of the teacher and the pupil however did not manifest itself, until the revolution of France had brought forward a question, which tended to destroy the influence of parliamentary party, and to reduce the government to a democracy. In that tendency Mr. Fox saw nothing alarming; to Mr. Burke it was at variance with all the habits of his political conduct. In the interval the Whigs assumed the second form of their political character since the accession

[37] He had acted in Ireland as private secretary to William Gerard Hamilton, generally known by the appellation of *Single-speech* Hamilton, secretary of the lord lieutenant; but was at this time in London employed in conducting the publication of the Annual Register for Dodsley, a bookseller.—Nicholls's Recollections, pp. 19, 20.

of the Hanoverian family. They had been an oligarchy of leading families, maintained and assisted by the influence of the crown, which was placed at their disposal. They were at this time a party in opposition composed of the same leading families, but led on by the genius of Burke[38], and strengthened by the eloquence and the amiable and attaching qualities of Fox.

The personal character of lord North was such, as developed these important results in the manner least prejudicial to the government. The dispute with America did not originate in his administration. Having found it already begun, he prosecuted it with hesitation, though it was so acceptable to the people[39], that many members of the opposition-party at one time retired from the parliament, despairing of success in a struggle, in which they were not supported by the nation. The private integrity of the minister, which was unimpeached, gave dignity to his administration; the extraordinary amenity of his manners disarmed the animosity of his opponents even in the most violent contentions. He was the minister of the crown, and he laboured to support its pretensions; but his support was qualified by his morality and his moderation[40]. The great faults of his government were a facility of compliance, and a dilatory indecision. These fitted him to lose America, but they did not qualify him to be dangerous to the constitution.

Of Canada, the acquisition of which was the germ of American independence, it may be remarked that, since the American revolution, it has discharged a new function in maintaining the combination of the union, agreeably to the general law of political associations. In some future, perhaps not a distant period, the dissolution of the union may generate a plurality of governments, which shall exercise a

[38] Mr. Burke after some time ceased to command the attention of the house of commons, perhaps because he tired it by speaking too often, and too long. Mr. Fox then became the leader in debate, but Mr. Burke seems always to have exercised a controlling influence.

[39] Adolphus, vol. ii. pp. 411, 412. This secession occurred in the year 1776.

[40] 'I have no doubt,' says Mr. Nicholls, 'that he would have preferred to have pursued those measures, which he thought most beneficial to his country; but the place of prime minister was pleasant to him, and he persevered in the war for four years longer.'—Recollections, p. 37.

reciprocal control; but, until this division shall have been by some means effected, it must be important to the confederacy, that it should be neighboured by a territory belonging to a distinct power, which, however connected with it by origin, by language, by manners, and by commercial interests, must yet be considered as separate and, by possibility, hostile.

To Ireland the war of America was the epoch of constitutional improvement. In the language of the father of Irish independence, 'that war was the harvest of Ireland.' Great Britain in that arduous struggle discovered the necessity of conceding those rights of commerce and legislation, which raised that portion of the empire from the misery of a beggared province to the enjoyment of some portion of the prosperity of national independence. The war of America was to Ireland, what the wars of Louis XIV. had been to the sister-island, the birth-pang of its political importance. The next war terminated its separate history. The American revolution raised Ireland to the rank of a kingdom; the revolution of France, eighteen years afterwards, incorporated it with the government of Great Britain.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the history of Ireland, from the revolution of England in the year 1688 *to the accession of George I. in the year* 1714.

The treaty of Limerick in the year 1691—The penal code begun, 1695 —Anne queen, 1702—The penal code completed, 1709.

The revolution, which placed William on the throne of the British islands, however ultimately beneficial to every part of the empire, was not, in its immediate operation, the epoch of the constitutional liberty of Ireland. It however arrested the violence, which would have overwhelmed in one common ruin the religious establishment of the Protestants and the political rights both of them and of the

Roman Catholics, and it proved to be the commencement of a series of events, which, at the close of almost a century, terminated in bestowing upon the country the blessings of political freedom and of commercial prosperity. This was all, which it could effect for a country, so unprepared for receiving the adjustment of a balanced constitution. Its parties had been long opposed, not in the civic struggle of contending orders, eager for pre-eminence, and slowly ascertaining their political situation amidst alternate advantages, but in the deadly feud of exasperated enemies, who saw their safety only in the entire subjugation, and the lasting depression of their adversaries. The two religious parties of the people being committed together in hostility at that time irreconcilable, all which could then be done for liberty, was to humble that, which had attached itself to the support of despotism, and to establish the other in the undisputed possession of the power of the state. Torn as the country had been for ages by the violences of its parties, it was incapable of becoming the scene of a combination so rare and precious, as a duly balanced and comprehensive constitution. These parties could not be brought to co-operate in any common system of political action, and it appears to have been indispensable to the subsequent prosperity of Ireland, that one of them should for a time be excluded, not only from all participation of the government, but also from the enjoyment of almost all the rights of subjects.

Nor did even the protestant party of Ireland at that time possess the privileges of freedom[1]. Independently of the claim of external control, which was asserted by the parliament of England, and actually exercised to the prejudice of the commercial interest of the country, those domestic rights, which are of more immediate concern, were destitute of the protection belonging to a government of liberty. The duration of the parliament was limited only by the pleasure, or by the life of the sovereign; the judges were the dependent ministers of the executive authority; and

[1] Soon after the bill of rights had been enacted in England, eleven heads of a similar bill for Ireland were presented by the Irish parliament for transmission, but suppressed.—Plowden's Historical Review of the State of Ireland, vol. i. p. 370. London, 1803.

from the abuse of power no man could defend himself by the invaluable writ of *habeas corpus*. The government bore an exterior resemblance to that of England, for it had the states of parliament distributed in the like manner, and conducting their proceedings in a close correspondence of formality; but the frame was not animated by the soul of freedom, and served only to maintain a recollection of the original, which it affected to represent. The Roman Catholics were depressed, but the Protestants were not free. The struggle for ascendency had ceased, but the struggle for a constitution remained; and it was only the entire removal of all apprehension of a renewal of the former, which could permit the Protestants to engage in the latter with the English government.

The opinion here stated is not the refinement of a theorist, imagining a combination of causes and effects, which may be best accommodated to a favourite system, but the avowed sentiment of the orator of Irish freedom, who was also the grand and persevering advocate of the relaxation of all restrictions specially affecting the Roman Catholics. 'The penal code,' said Mr. Grattan[2], 'is the shell, in which the protestant power has been hatched; and, now it is become a bird, it must burst the shell asunder, or perish in it.' In all the eagerness of reprobation, with which he inveighed against the code of exclusion, he saw however that it had prepared the ground, on which he then contended for its abolition. He condemned the choice of those, who should persist in preferring 'a protestant settlement to an Irish nation;' but he clearly perceived, that the previous establishment of that settlement, fortified as it had been on every side by the impenetrable barrier of the penal laws, had cherished and matured the power, with the aid of which he afterwards vindicated the liberties of his country.

The penal code, which suppressed the struggle of the Irish parties, by reducing to an extreme, but a temporary humiliation, that one which was formidable by its numbers, and by its principles unaccommodated to the recent revolution, was thus the apparatus of the subsequent aggrandisement of Ireland. The revolution of England accordingly, though not an epoch of actual liberty to the neighbouring

[2] Seward's Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 298. Dubl., 1801.

island, was yet a crisis of its distant preparation ; and circumstanced as that island was in regard to domestic dissension, the preparation appears to have been that, which alone was adapted to its peculiar situation. If the two parties had been maintained together in the common possession of the same rights, it would have been the obvious policy of the English government to play the one against the other, and so to preserve an ascendency over both. It would have been also the not less obvious policy of France to avail itself of the discontent of a depressed party, before it should be finally put down. Nothing could enable the Protestants to assert against the dominion of the more powerful country the independent enjoyment of commercial and constitutional freedom, except that they should stand alone in the country, embarrassed by no interfering pretensions of a rival party. The Roman Catholics of Ireland had borne their unconscious part in the adjustment of the constitution of England ; and, when this had been effected at the revolution, they ceased for a time to exist as a party, while the Protestants acquired strength to vindicate to themselves a participation of the liberty then established.

The conduct of James in his government of Ireland, after he had abandoned England to the enterprise of William, served in various ways, as has been already remarked, to strengthen the cause of the revolution in the country, which he had left. It may here be observed, that it was not less auxiliary to the only direct operation, which that revolution could have in a country so circumstanced as Ireland, since it stimulated the Protestants to complete the humiliation of the Roman Catholics. To the people of England it was a period of royal probation, which exhibited without disguise the bigotry and despotism of the prince, who had abdicated their throne, and, convincing all, who still hesitated between their habitual allegiance and their patriotism, that it had become necessary to sacrifice the former to the latter, gave a secure establishment to the yet recent and unsettled change of the government. The unhappy situation of Ireland did not admit an influence of this kind. The struggle in that part of the empire was for power and safety, not for allegiance or freedom ; and the conduct of James could hasten its termination, only by affording occasion to the violent de-

pression of one of the contending parties. In this manner indeed it was hastened by every imaginable exasperation of the Protestants, who were thus taught, in this short interval, to regard the Roman Catholics as a party, the existence of which was incompatible with their own security. The strength of their adversaries, if not accompanied by provocation so alarming, might perhaps have suggested the expediency of mutual forbearance and toleration, and thus have retained the country in a state of balanced opposition; but the provocation, given by the Irish government of James II., was so outrageous, that the ruin of his party was irrevocably decided, and the ground-plot of Irish prosperity was prepared by the entire removal of an interfering interest.

While James still wore the crown of England, he was sensible of the necessity of so moderating his conduct, that it might not cause any unnecessary alarm to his protestant subjects. Even after he had abandoned England, he was still influenced by the hope of effecting his restoration, and was therefore still desirous of declining to adopt those extreme measures, towards which he was urged by his Roman Catholic adherents; but, then depending entirely on that party for his support, he was necessitated to secure their attachment by an unlimited compliance with their demands. Not only therefore were persons of that party placed in all the confidential situations of the state, but by the repeal of the acts of settlement a very extensive arrangement of the property of the country was reversed in their favour, when it had subsisted during twenty-seven years[3] Nor was that party contented with a reversal of these important statutes, their act being extended to an almost total confiscation of the landed property of the Protestants, subjecting to forfeiture the estates of all those persons, residing in any of the three kingdoms, who did not acknowledge James to be king, or, which comprehended almost every individual among them, who had maintained any correspondence with his adversaries. This act might be deemed a very sufficient indulgence of the violence of the Roman Catholics, as it not only resumed the forfeitures of the restoration, but also swept away the remnant of the property of the Protestants. But mere plunder could not satisfy it. An act was passed,

[3] Leland, vol. iii. p. 538.

proscribing as guilty of high treason two thousand four hundred and sixty-one persons, whom the king was precluded from pardoning after an appointed day. Certain periods were indeed assigned, within which the persons, thus hastily and arbitrarily condemned, were permitted to prove their innocence; but the statute was carefully concealed from the knowledge of those, whom it so deeply concerned, nor was a view of it obtained by any individual of the number, until four months had elapsed from the day limited for pardoning.

While such were the acts of the party, the measures of James himself were atrocious violations of the principles of the constitution. The house of commons, which he convened, was almost wholly composed of persons nominated by his authority. Even while a parliament thus constituted was sitting, he imposed a tax by an arbitrary proclamation; and he eked out his exaction by the coinage of base money, for which he extorted, at rates fixed by himself, the staple commodities of the kingdom. By these measures the abhorrence of despotism was combined with the strong animosity of religious party. The Protestants learned to dread the ascendency of the adversaries of their church, as the completion of all the evils of rapine, tyranny and proscription, and saw no safety except in maintaining, with the most jealous and vigilant precaution, the superiority, which was after a short struggle transferred to them by the issue of the war. Grievous were the charges, which the Protestants of that day were warranted to bring against the Roman Catholics; and 'grievously,' it must be acknowledged, have the latter 'answered' them.

The war had been begun in Ireland even before the arrival of James, the Protestants having in various parts of the country taken up arms, to support the cause of the prince of Orange, then sovereign of England. These efforts were however soon reduced to the brave resistance of the Enniskilleners and the justly celebrated defence of Derry. By the uncalculating, but successful, heroism of these two parties of Protestants, were the exertions baffled, first of the chief governor, and then of James himself, and the common cause of their religion and liberty was maintained, until William arrived with an army to rescue the country

from a government, which would have placed it in dependence upon France[4], broken down the resources of Great Britain by a near and harassing hostility, and by enfeebling the British power have thrown into confusion the whole system of the federative policy of Europe. This brief, but most important war, was concluded in the year 1691 by the capitulation of Limerick, by which the superiority of the Protestants was established, and the political connexion of the two islands secured.

It has been often, and vehemently urged by the Roman Catholics and their advocates, that the treaty then concluded was grossly violated by the Protestants, who were accordingly required to vindicate the national faith by conceding to the former an equality of civil and political rights[5]. No plea could be more destitute of foundation. The treaty consisted of two distinct sets of articles; the military, which were executed at the time, and the civil, which became the subject of complaint and controversy. Of the civil articles the first[6], which alone was general, conceded to the Roman Catholics that they should, in regard to their religion, be placed in the same situation, in which they had been under the government of Charles II. The other articles, which were not general like the first, secured to certain persons, or classes of persons, the possession of their properties, and the exercise of their professions and trades. The first of the civil articles is therefore that alone, concerning which any general controversy could be raised.

It is obvious to remark, that the separation of the treaty into two distinct sets of articles, one civil, the other military, implies very plainly that both parties understood, that

[4] It has been ascertained by M. Mazure, that the earl of Tyrconnell, lord lieutenant in the year 1687, negotiated with the court of France for the separation of the two islands, if James should die, and a Protestant succeed to the crown of England, himself to be king of Ireland. —Hist. de la Revol, tome ii. pp. 287, 288. [5] 'Those,' says Mr. Hallam, 'who argue from the treaty of Limerick against any political disabilities subsisting at present, do injury to a good cause.'—Const. Hist., vol. iii. p. 532, note. [6] The ninth article, concerning the oath to be administered to Roman Catholics, plainly relates to the second, and was therefore limited to the several classes of persons then living, who should be permitted to hold estates on submission.

the military articles might then be finally concluded, as in any other case of military operations, but that the civil articles, as involving considerations of government, could not be valid, unless they should be ratified by some civil authority. A confirmation of these others was indeed promised in the treaty to be obtained from the king, and they were accordingly by him confirmed; but it was well understood, that even the authority of the king was not sufficient for determining questions of the constitution, and the first article therefore, which alone was general, contained an express reference to the authority of a parliament, for such further, or stronger security, as the ratification of the king himself was unable to afford. The parliament, in its act of confirmation, omitted the first article, restricting at the same time the rest in various particulars.

No regulation had yet been made for excluding Roman Catholics from the Irish parliament; but at this time, when the question of ascendency had been decided by the struggle of James, it was deemed by the English parliament necessary that the parliament, shortly to be assembled in Ireland for the regulation of the affairs of that country, should be exclusively protestant. A statute was accordingly enacted for this purpose in England in the year following the capitulation of Limerick; and by the authority of this statute the constitution of the Irish parliament was actually regulated, until a similar regulation was formally adopted by that parliament in the second year of the reign of Anne, or after an interval of ten years[7]. The elective franchise was however not wholly taken from the Roman Catholics of Ireland until the year 1727[8].

A parliament was assembled in Ireland in the year 1692, after an interruption of twenty-six years, unless the assembly convened by James after his abdication should be admitted as entitled to that name. A contest about the right of originating money-bills having very soon arisen between this parliament and the lord lieutenant, it was speedily pro-

[7] The statute of the second of Anne prescribes only the oaths of allegiance and abjuration for voters at elections.—Const. Hist., vol. iii. p. 535, note. [8] It had before been allowed to those who had taken the oath of allegiance, and afterwards to those who had taken, besides that oath, the oath of abjuration.

rogued, and was dissolved in the following year. The question of the ratification of the articles of Limerick was on this account postponed to the year 1695, when a restricted confirmation, as has been mentioned, was enacted. It is observable that the earliest of those statutes, which constituted the penal code, was enacted in the same session. The beginning therefore of that code, instead of having been, as it has been often represented, a perfidious violation of a treaty formally concluded, and acknowledged, was a contemporary expression of the sentiments of the legislature, to which of necessity the ratification of the civil part of the treaty had been referred, the right of legislating freely for the Roman Catholics, as a collective body, having been thus practically asserted at the very time, when the civil articles of the treaty, which were not of a general nature, were partially confirmed.

The penal code, begun in this second Irish parliament of William, was completed in the reign of Anne. It has indeed been remarked by lord Taaf[9], that all the severity of the penal operations against the Roman Catholics must be ascribed to that princess, William having resisted them as much as he was able, and the Hanoverian family having brought from Germany a habit of toleration, which moderated the enforcement of the laws, even before any formal relaxation of the system had been commenced. It was thus the fortune of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to experience the greatest severity under the government of a sovereign of that family, to which they had been strongly and dangerously attached; and Mr. Plowden has been willing to suppose[10], that this may have contributed not a little, to hinder them from relapsing into their former predilection for its cause, when Scotland took arms in support of its pretensions.

It may naturally be supposed, that the increased severity of the penal code, occurring in a subsequent reign, could have been the work only of conscious superiority trampling on vanquished resistance, and abusing its triumph to the purposes of unprovoked, and therefore unwarranted oppression. Evidence can however be adduced to prove, that these

[9] Observations on the Affairs of Ireland. [10] Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 210.

measures were felt to be justified by the necessity of self-defence. Before the penal laws of Anne were enacted, the lords of Ireland had expressed a desire of entering into an incorporating union with England; and their representation was repeated, when they had occasion to congratulate the queen on the completion of the Scotish union. The triumph of present superiority, if felt to be secure, would have dictated a different conduct. If those lords had felt that they possessed a safe predominance, they could not have been disposed to humble themselves in this manner to the sister-government, but would rather have sought to enjoy their ascendency in independence. It is therefore reasonable to believe that they sought protection by this expedient against adversaries, from whom they apprehended danger. Their applications appear to have been disregarded for the same reason, for which they had been made, the English government relying upon the exposed situation of the Irish Protestants for the continuance of their dependence, and therefore declining to receive them into a copartnership in the constitution and commerce of England. The Irish Protestants, abandoned to their own exertions, proceeded to deprive of all political strength the numerous, and therefore still powerful party, by which they were menaced[11].

That the apprehensions of the Protestants of Ireland were well founded, has lately been proved by the incontestable evidence of doctor Doyle[12], in which it is expressly stated, that all the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland were all nominated by the pope in conformity to the recommendation of the pretender. That the measures then employed by them in their own defence, were necessary to the maintenance of the connexion with England, and consequently to the safety of the Irish Protestants, has been attested by Mr. Moore[13], a Roman Catholic, and an advocate of the claims of his brethren of the same church, who has even declared his persuasion, that in maintaining that connexion,

[11] The property of the Roman Catholics had suffered by a new confiscation, comprehending about one million and sixty thousand acres. Under the treaty of Limerick 233,106 acres were restored, and about 75,000 by special favour.—O'Driscoll's Hist. of Ireland, vol. ii. p. 365. Lond., 1827. [12] Evidence before the Parliamentary Committees. [13] Hist. of the British Revolution, pp. 524, 556.

the Irish Protestants of that period 'have more than redeemed all the wrongs, which they inflicted on the Irish people.'

To have maintained the connexion with England would however have been little advantageous to Ireland, if the suppression of the Roman Catholics as a party in the state, had not eventually made way for the independence and consequent prosperity of this part of the empire. This indeed is a view, which discovers the opening of a splendid scene of national aggrandisement out of the thickest gloom of public misery; which may afford gratification even to Roman Catholics in the contemplation of advantages largely participated, and is philosophically interesting as it exhibits an important and beneficial result not foreseen by any of the parties concerned in the operation. Brief was the period of Irish independence, but not so the enjoyment of its advantages, for that independence by a necessary consequence brought on the incorporating union, which has given them permanence. The measures of the English government, in the reigns of William and of Anne, may prove how necessary it was to the future prosperity of Ireland, that such a matrix, as the penal code was described by Mr. Grattan to be, in his simile of the egg, should have been provided for cherishing its weakness, which must else have been exposed to an influence unfriendly to its growth.

It very early appeared that the English government entertained no disposition to extend to Ireland that constitutional freedom, which itself had secured by the revolution. In the year 1689[14], when the bill of rights had been enacted in England, eleven heads of a similar bill for Ireland were presented by the Irish parliament for transmission, but suppressed. When of two money-bills, which had been transmitted from England, one had been rejected by the commons of that parliament, as not having originated from themselves though the other was passed in consideration of the public exigency, this new effort of liberty was met by an angry prorogation, which after some delay terminated in a dissolution. In consequence of this contest Molyneux published, in the year 1698. his Case of Ireland, in which he zealously

[14] Plowden's Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 370.

maintained the entire independence of the Irish parliament[15]. That parliament had also, a short time before, advanced a practical claim of independence, by re-enacting with some alterations a law[16], which had passed in England for the regulation of Ireland, styling in their own bill the crown of Ireland imperial. These incidents having inflamed the jealousy of the parliament of England, a vehement address was presented to the king by both houses in a body, and the spirit of Irish independence was crushed for three-fourths of a century.

That the two governments should thus have clashed in their political institutions, was the unavoidable result of their ill-arranged connexion, and could be remedied only by the incorporating union, in which that connexion has ultimately terminated. The mischievous influence experienced by the commercial interest of Ireland was the effect of superior power. When the ignorance of the English government had, in the reign of Charles II., proscribed the importation of the live cattle of Ireland, the landed proprietors of that country, while, agreeably to the prediction of Sir William Temple[17], they began the exportation of beef, turned their attention also to the business of feeding sheep, and the manufacture of woollen cloth, which had been long established in it, was considerably extended in consequence of the augmented supply of the material. Sir Robert Walpole was known to say, that the jealousy of the English had

[15] The controversy was begun in the year 1641 in an argument delivered by Patrick Darcy, a member of the Irish house of commons, by an order of that house in conference with a committee of the house of lords. Twenty-one queries concerning grievances were at this conference propounded for the consideration of the judges, the first of which was, 'whether the subjects of this kingdom be a free people, and to be governed only by the common laws of England, and statutes of force in this kingdom?' This appears to have been a reaction caused by the government of the earl of Strafford, who with four others was then charged with high treason.—An Argument, &c. Waterford, 1643, Dublin, 1764. Two treatises on the contrary sides of this question are contained in Harris's Hibernica, the one ascribed to lord chancellor Bolton, but more probably the work of the before mentioned Patrick Darcy, the other by serjeant, or rather judge Mayart.

[16] An act for abrogating the oath of supremacy and appointing other oaths.—Plowden, vol. i. p. 204.

[17] Works of Sir William Temple, vol. i. p. 117.

been excited in the reign of William by the boasting of some of those proprietors, who on this occasion indulged that magnificence of character, to which they are still addicted. The effects of this unseasonable display of grandiloquence were, that both houses of the English parliament addressed the king in very strenuous representations of the mischief of Irish prosperity; that the king found himself obliged to answer, that he would do all which in him lay, to discourage the woollen-manufacture of Ireland; and that Ireland was compelled to abandon a prosperous manufacture[18], the material of which it possessed in abundance, for the hope of giving prosperity to another, the exportation of which, in the year succeeding this transaction, produced little more than the eighth part of the value of that of the former[19].

The author of the treatise last quoted[20] has ascribed to a mistaken application of the principle of colonisation this interference with the commercial industry of Ireland, by which it was long and grievously oppressed. The principle of that system is that the colony should supply the mother-country with the materials of manufacture, and receive in return manufactured goods. Agreeably to it the English claimed a monopoly of the wool of Ireland, as the material of their own great manufacture, contented to abandon to the Irish another, in which they had not themselves engaged. The just application of the principle however would require, that the climate and produce of the colony should be so different, as to render the interchange of unmanufactured produce and manufactured goods mutually beneficial. In the case of Ireland there was on the contrary a similarity so perfect, as to render the arrangement a direct and manifest sacrifice of the interest of the one country to the present advantage of the other.

It was indeed the fortune of Ireland to suffer from its anomalous situation a complicated oppression. Having been, in the reign of Charles II., considered as a distinct state, and not as a colony, it was, by an act passed in the fifteenth year

[18] The annual value of the exported woollens was 110,000*l*. the fifth part of the whole exports of the country.—Mr. Foster's Speech on the Union, p. 83. Dublin, 1799. [19] Little more than 14,000*l*.—Commercial Restraints of Ireland Considered, p. 93. Dublin, 1779. This treatise was attributed to the right honourable John Hely Hutchinson.

[20] Ibid., pp. 155, &c.

of that reign, debarred from exporting to the colonies any other commodities, than servants, horses, victuals, and salt; and being in the reign of William regarded as a colony, it was then compelled to surrender a prosperous manufacture, that it might not interfere with the interest of the parent state. It was thus brought within a system of colonial law on more disadvantageous conditions, than any of the settlements of America. While the similarity of climate and produce rendered the colonial monopoly particularly grievous, the ambiguous relation of the country to the English government had almost debarred it from that colonial traffic, which was open to the settlements of the western continent.

If it should be asked, why did the Protestants of Ireland submit so long to this double domination of constitution and commerce, which in the year 1782 they indignantly cast from them, the answer must be that their domestic security was not firmly established, until the Roman Catholics had been deprived of all power in the state. Dreading domestic adversaries more numerous than themselves, they found themselves necessitated, until these had been reduced to unimportance, to yield to an external authority, which coerced their independence and shackled their industry.

It may furnish matter of interesting reflection, that the very measures adopted by the English government, for repressing the manufacturing competition of Ireland, tended directly to accelerate the crisis, in which were thrown off the restrictions, which it had imposed. The destruction of the woollen manufacture operated with more general influence upon the Roman Catholics, who chiefly occupied the provinces, in which it had flourished. The encouragement of the linen-manufacture of Ulster, the province chiefly occupied by Protestants, favoured the Protestant interests, as was alleged by the English parliament. Manufacturing industry was thus at once ruined among the Roman Catholics, and encouraged among the Protestants; and the combined operation of the double measure hastened the arrival of the time, when the latter, freed from all apprehension of the former, were enabled to assert the constitutional independence and the commercial freedom of their country.

The English government indeed appears to have become sensible, that the entire humiliation of the Roman Catholics

was not consistent with the policy of England, consenting with reluctance to the completion of the penal code. When, in the year 1703, a bill had been transmitted from Ireland for reducing the power of the Roman Catholics, especially by enacting that their estates should be equally divided among their children, unless the heirs should conform to the established church[21], a clause was added for imposing a test, to the exclusion of protestant dissenters from the parliament, in the hope that this addition would cause the bill to be rejected after its return in the parliament of Ireland, where the presbyterian interest possessed considerable strength. The parliament of Ireland was however contented to pass the bill even with this addition, trusting that the offensive clause would be repealed, while the main object of the bill would remain unaffected. The actual operation of the clause was that the presbyterian party generally conformed to the established church, much less alienation existing between the two protestant churches in Ireland, than in England.

The number of the Protestants of Ireland received some augmentation in the year 1709, by the arrival of a considerable party of German fugitives, who had been driven from their homes by the desolation of the Palatine[22]. Of several thousands, who had sought shelter and protection in England, five hundred families were removed to Ireland, where they were established in various settlements, remaining to the present time. Nor can it be said, that no effort was made within this period to bring over the Roman Catholics to the protestant church. Efforts on the contrary were made, with considerable promise of success, both in the north and in the south; but the state of the country was unfavourable to them, and they were soon frustrated by the very means employed for giving them greater efficacy.

[21] Burnet, vol. ii. pp. 216, 217. [22] Tindal, p. 626. The migration originally consisted of six thousand five hundred and twenty, men, women, and children. The kind reception, which these experienced, encouraged so many others, that it became necessary to stop the migration at the Hague. Many Roman Catholics having come with the Protestants, those of them who did not voluntarily change their religion, were sent home. Of the Palatines some were sent to Carolina, and the greatest part to New York. In Ireland a sum of 5000*l.* annually for three years was voted for their establishment.

Two individuals in distant parts of Ireland[23], the reverend Nicholas Brown in the diocese of Clogher in the year 1702, and not long afterwards the reverend Walter Atkins in the diocese of Cloyne, applied themselves to this important work, by addressing the people in the language, which they understood. Of the former of these zealous clergymen it has been recorded, that he took care to attend a congregation of his Roman Catholic parishioners, just when their service was concluded, and then read to them, in their own language, the prayers of the established church. On one of these occasions the Roman Catholic clergyman, to draw away his congregation from their new devotion, for they joined earnestly in our service, cried aloud that these prayers had been stolen from the church of Rome. 'If it was so,' said a grave old native, 'they have stolen the best, as thieves generally do.' Of the other we are informed, that the native Irish were so much gratified with the offices of religion, which he performed for them in the Irish language, that they sent for him from all parts of his very extensive parish; that one of them was heard to say, at a funeral, at which he thus officiated, that, if they could have that service always, they would go no more to mass; and that he was requested to forbear celebrating so many marriages of Roman Catholics, lest he should leave their clergymen destitute of sufficient means of subsistence.

In the beginning of the year 1710, when most of the Roman Catholic clergy, by declining to swear the oath of abjuration, had rendered themselves liable to great penalties, if they should exercise their function, some clergymen of the established church, deeming it lamentable that the Irish should be left without religion, resolved to imitate these two persons, and their efforts were rewarded with the pleased attention of the Roman Catholics. Delighted with hearing the prayers of the Protestants in their own language, they openly declared that the service was very good, and that they disapproved of praying in any unknown tongue. Some of them also were observed to be much affected, when

[23] This and the two following paragraphs have been taken from a Memoir on the Irish Reformation, of the years 1826 and 1827, inserted in the British Critic for January 1828, which had been furnished by the author to that journal, at the request of the editor.

they listened to the scriptures, thus, probably for the first time, brought within their knowledge.

Here was a fair opening for prosecuting a reformation of religion in Ireland. The country was not then, as in the time of Bedell, agitated by treasonable intrigue, or by open rebellion, for the strife of parties had been decided by the success and ascendency of the Protestants. The Roman Catholics also, as far as they were tried, appear to have received with gratitude and interest the exertions of pious Protestants, to give them more just conceptions of religion. Why then was the salutary work interrupted? Did the Protestants become indifferent to the propagation of a purer faith, or were they obstructed by new difficulties, which they were unable to surmount? The answer to that interesting enquiry has been furnished by the reverend John Richardson, who, in the year 1712, gave to the public the narrative[24], from which these particulars have been collected. This pious clergyman has intimated, that the principal reason, why the reformed religion had not made a greater progress in Ireland, was that dependence had been placed on political, rather than on evangelical means, for its propagation; and his own narrative shows, that these very men, pious and zealous as they undoubtedly were, fell into this grievous error, and so were led away from the right path, by which they might have extensively communicated the knowledge of the gospel. The very success indeed of their efforts was the occasion of their ultimate failure. It was deemed expedient to interest the government of the country in the prosecution of the work, which had been so happily undertaken. The government expressed a disposition most favourable to the wishes of the friends of the measure; but the convocation and the parliament were also to be consulted, and the latter of these assemblies, though they, too, approved the principle of addressing the Irish Roman Catholics in their own language, judged it necessary to the maintenance of the connexion with Great Britain, to enforce the acquisition of the English tongue. When it is also considered, that the parliament had two years before this time completed the penal code, it

[24] A Short History of the Attempts that have been made to Convert the Popish Natives of Ireland, etc., by John Richardson. Lond. 1712.

will be easily understood, that the principle, which all had joined in commending, was speedily forgotten, and that the entire dependence of the Protestants was placed on the efficacy of force.

While political proscription was vainly preferred to instruction and exhortation, for converting the Roman Catholics to the faith of the Protestants, the latter were discountenanced by the selfishness of the landed proprietors of their own religious persuasion[25]. It had been an old policy with the Irish proprietors to prefer an Irish tenantry to English settlers, because the Irish had from ancient times been accustomed to submit to oppressive exactions, and, being contented with a poorer and meaner subsistence, could gratify the rapacity of their landlords with larger rents. Notwithstanding all the experience, which the Irish Protestants had of the views of the Roman Catholics in the recent struggle of the revolution, and in direct contradiction to their own professed conviction of the necessity of supporting a protestant interest in the country, the proprietors adhered to the same policy after that event, giving them a general preference in leasing their lands[26]. It was well understood that there was for land a protestant price and a popish price. Protestants had a taste for comfort and independence, which, while it rendered them respectable, disabled them for undertaking to pay rents, which could be spared by those, who required only to satisfy the cravings of merely animal nature. The proprietors yielded to the temptation of increased incomes, and discouraged those, whom they should have protected. Many of the rejected Protestants were driven to emigrate to the American colonies; many of those who remained, probably sunk into the religion, as well as the habits, of their new associates.

In these circumstances it could not be deemed surprising that the proportion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to the Protestants should have much increased since the revolution, though as a political party they were long deprived

[25] Sir John Davies, pp. 115, 116, 131—133. Baron Finglas's Breviate of Ireland, p. 84. Sir Thomas Philip's Letter to King Charles I., pp. 246, 247. Pynnar's Survey of Ulster, no. 132—135. These three are contained in Harris's Hibernica. [26] A pamphlet on this subject published in the year 1746.

of importance. It does not appear however that such an increase has actually occurred, whatever may have been the pretensions of their partisans[27]. According to sir William Petty they were to the Protestants in the year 1672, as eight to three, or less than in the proportion of three to one. In the year 1735 a calculation was made from the bills of mortality in Dublin, for seven years, which estimated the proportion, as that of nine to four, or little more than that of two to one. In the year 1736 a calculation was made from the numbers of families in Ireland, in the years 1732 and 1733, which gave the proportion precisely the same, as in the first instance. So far no reason appears for supposing any increase of the relative number of the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholic convention, in the year 1792, claimed an increase for the first time, but a very small one, for it was then only assumed that the Roman Catholics were to the Protestants, as three to one. An estimate of the proportion was however submitted by Mr. (now baron) Foster to a committee of the house of lords, in the year 1825, the detail of the protestant population being taken from the returns made by the clergy of both churches; and according to this gentleman it was somewhat less than that of two and a half to one. On the other hand[28], according to the returns of the Roman Catholic clergy, made in the year 1824, it little exceeded the ratio of these numbers. So far therefore as can be collected, the proportion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to the Protestants, notwithstanding all the discouragement experienced by the latter, and the injudicious methods long employed for proselyting the former[29], may be considered as having experi-

[27] The following particulars have been taken from Newland's Apology for the Established Church in Ireland, pp. 189—192. Dubl. 1829.

[28] The numbers returned were 4,980,209 Roman Catholics, and 1,963,487 Protestants.

[29] In the memoir already cited from the British Critic, it was stated that, in the growing liberality of the Protestants, the hope of proselyting by proscription was at length abandoned, and an expectation began to be entertained that, when all political irritation should have been removed by the abolition of all political distinctions, the Roman Catholics would of themselves become sensible of the superior purity of the religion of Protestants, and renounce their own church. Unfortunately for this expectation, they still found something to desire, which had not yet been conceded, and the consciousness of increasing strength and importance supplied

enced[30] no augmentation within a century and a half preceding the present time.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the history of Ireland, from the accession of George I. in the year 1714, *to the end of the government of lord Townshend in the year* 1772.

George I. king in the year 1714—Legislative superiority asserted by Great Britain, 1719—An English interest formed, 1724—George II. king, 1727—The *undertakers*, 1742—George III. king, 1760—The government of lord Townshend begun, 1767—The octennial act, 1768—Swift—Berkeley.

At the death of Anne the Roman Catholics had ceased to be considered by their adversaries, and even to consider themselves, as competent to maintain a struggle for pre-eminence. The whole power of the state had been before that time placed in the hands of the Protestants, and the history of a long succeeding period is the narrative merely of the management and the modifications of this party, and of the gradual development of its independence in regard

a new and powerful motive for adhering to a party already considerable in the state. At length, in the year 1826, the public was surprised with the announcement, that numerous conversions had occurred in Cavan; and in that and the following year the same spirit was manifested in various other parts of Ireland, especially in the western province. This gratifying change was traced, neither to the severity of the restrictive, nor to the liberality of the conciliating system, but to the efforts exerted by various societies, during twenty-five years, for the scriptural education of the poor. It appears to have been suppressed, at least for a time, by the new gratification, which the Roman Catholics received in the year 1829, when the restriction was removed, which had excluded them from both houses of parliament.

[30] In the report made by commissioners in the year 1835, the number of protestants of the established church was stated to be 850,000, and the gross number of protestants to be about 1,500,000, the whole population a little exceeding 8,000,000. This would make the ratio of protestants to Roman Catholics a little less than a fourth part; but the report is entitled to little credit.

to the government of Great Britain. Against the overbearing control of the British government the country could not struggle, so long as the contention of an opposing party rendered the Protestants dependent on it even for personal protection. The entire reduction however of the Roman Catholics permitted the Protestants to exert some efforts of independence; the depressed party, having been long estranged from political rivalry, saw their only hope of advantage in reinforcing the pretensions of those, who had formerly been their adversaries; and a favourable crisis of embarrassment in the concerns of the empire enabled the then united people of Ireland to assert their claim of independence with a firmness, which received a prompt attention from the government of Great Britain.

During some few years after the accession of George I., the affairs of Ireland appear to have been conducted by the British legislature in a quiet maintenance of the superiority, which was possessed by Great Britain. An incident at length occurred, which gave occasion to an open declaration of that superiority, and thus challenged the resistance of the Irish parliament. Though the English lords had, in the year 1698, received an appeal from Ireland, on which occasion they even declared that the peers of Ireland possessed no appellant jurisdiction, the latter continued to receive appeals, until the year 1717, when another cause was removed by appeal to England. The treatise of Molyneux, which had been published on the former occasion, was so well received in Ireland[1], that those judges, who admitted appeals to England, were persecuted with the greatest rigour by both houses of the parliament. It was therefore, on this other occasion, deemed necessary by the parliament of Great Britain, to pass a declaratory act, asserting its own supreme legislative authority. The year 1719, in which this act was passed, marked the lowest depression of the Irish government in the period following the revolution. The parliament of Ireland silently submitted to the indignity, for the time was yet distant, when its patriots could dispute, whether

[1] Tract by Messieurs Burke in 1776; App. to Biographical, Literary, and Political Anecdotes, by the author of Anecdotes of the late Earl of Chatham, vol. iii. pp. 157, 158.

a simple repeal of this offensive statute was a sufficient security of the liberties of the nation.

The Irish suitors found their advantage in appealing to a jurisdiction removed from local affections and prepossessions, and not unwillingly sacrificed the pride of independent government to the purer administration of justice. For maintaining the claim of legislation however some management was required, which should render the Irish parliament tractable to the measures of a British minister. This was introduced by primate Boulter, who came to Ireland in the year 1724, and exercised a principal influence in the direction of the public affairs from that time to the year 1742. The principle of administration adopted by this prelate was to form and support an English interest in the government of Ireland. To this subject he perpetually recurs in his letters, and he appears to have, in a considerable degree, accomplished the execution of his plan. It was however a plan, which could scarcely be more than temporary. It required a vigilance, which should never be surprised into any incautious connexion with the native interests of the country; and those interests on the other hand would naturally, in the continuance of domestic tranquillity, acquire an increase of importance, which would embarrass the most vigilant management. The latter difficulty was almost sure to prevail in the progress of time. The former did actually perplex the administration of primate Boulter, and prepare the way for the introduction of a different system of government.

However successful even for a time may have been the efforts of this active prelate, the public mind, in the very beginning of his government, had begun to exhibit indications of an independent spirit. It seems indeed to be a burlesque of political agitations to ascribe political importance to a question concerning a coinage of copper. It however[2] involved the consideration of the independence of the Irish government, for a patent with this object had been granted to William Wood, without consulting either the lord-lieutenant or the privy-council of Ireland. The opportunity was eagerly seized by Swift, who had been brooding for years

[2] Life of Swift by Sir W. Scott, pp. 253—264. Edin., 1834.

over the final disappointment of his ambitious hopes. The letters of *the Draper* accordingly kindled a flame, which excited a serious alarm in the breasts of the ministers, whom he hated; and the public voice of Ireland was for the first time permitted to cause a retraction of a measure of the government of the empire. It is observable that primate Boulter has ascribed to this question a considerable influence[3], in effecting a combination of various parties, especially of the Protestants and Roman Catholics. The first struggle with the British government was thus occasioned by a question, which tended at the same time to generate domestic union.

Ireland at this time was distinguished by two literary patriots, both eminent for genius, but contrasted in almost every characteristic of their intellectual and moral qualities. Swift was a master of that sarcastic humour, which could so array in ridicule the object of his antipathy, as to draw upon it the utmost violence of the public scorn. His simplicity of language, while it approved itself to the scholar, was intelligible and acceptable to the populace. His keen observation of human life laid open to him all those resources of invective, which afford gratification to the malignity of our nature. Berkeley[4], who very differently interested himself in suggesting and recommending measures of domestic improvement was neither possessed of the humour, nor actuated by the malevolence of Swift. Elegant in his taste, sublime in his intellectual researches, and eulogised by Pope as gifted with 'every virtue under heaven,' he laboured to form a party, not against the British government, but in favour of economy and industry. The effect, which it produced, is not so distinguishable in the history of his country, as that of the controversial and acrimonious spirit of his contemporary, who addressed himself to dispositions of greater activity; but his *Querist* could not fail to have some beneficial operation, in communicating to the people of Ireland a just apprehension of their immediate interests. We can even discover in this ingenious treatise some curious

[3] Boulter's Letters, vol. i. p. 7. Dublin, 1770.

[4] A fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and afterwards bishop of Cloyne. He published various mathematical, theological, metaphysical, and miscellaneous treatises, and wrote several papers for Steele in the Guardian.

anticipations of the measures of a later time. The writer recommended the institution of a national bank, and the formation of an incorporating union with Great Britain; and in his suggestion of employing an inferior description of preachers for proselyting the lower orders of the Roman Catholics, he seems to have caught a glimpse of the utility of the scripture-readers, who in the recent efforts of reformation carried the genuine tidings of salvation into the cabins of a mistaught peasantry.

Five years had not elapsed from the arrival of primate Boulter, when he experienced the insecurity of his system of administration, in the miscarriage of a bill, which was rejected by the house of commons specifically because it had been originated by the privy council [5]. The system was indeed found to be generally sufficient for the management of the public business, so long as it was superintended by this active and vigilant prelate; but even in his time we perceive the beginnings of those powerful interests which soon afterwards reduced the office of the chief governor to the rank of an honourable pageant. In the year 1732 [6] we find him recommending for the support of the government Mr. Boyle, in his competition for the office of speaker of the house of commons, as a person who could not be opposed without the hazard of failure; and afterwards we observe the duke of Devonshire [7], who was appointed to the office of lord lieutenant five years before the death of primate Boulter, desiring to gain strength to his government from a double alliance, contracted with the family of Ponsonby.

From these beginnings was gradually formed the system of the government of Ireland which succeeded the plan of maintaining in it an English interest. This was the system of the *undertakers* [8]. It had become a system [9], that the go-

[5] Boulter's Letters, vol. i. p. 287. [6] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 76.

[7] Ibid., p. 168, note. [8] This appellation had been already so applied in England in the reign of James I. This prince, in the commencement of the session of the year 1614, found it necessary to deny, in two speeches, that he relied on the services of any such persons.—Parl. Hist., vol. v. pp. 277, 286. Sir Francis Bacon also then attorney-general, made an artful and apologetical speech in the house of commons on the same subject, 'when the house,' according to the title of the speech, 'was in great heat, and much troubled about the undertakers.'—Bacon's Works, vol. ii. p. 266. 4to. [9] Account of Ireland in 1773, by a late Chief Secretary (Lord Marcartney), pp. 28, 29. London, 1773.

vernment should be confided, during the long absences of the lord lieutenant, to the principal persons of the church and law, together with the speaker of the house of commons. The continued possession of this deputed power afforded a most favourable opportunity for the secure establishment of the great Irish interests, in the exercise of the influence and authority of the government; and the chief governors at length found, that they could not discharge their office in any other manner with so little trouble, as by surrendering almost the entire management to the Irish leaders, who in return undertook to ensure the unobstructed transaction of the public business. The system was favoured by the long continuance of the whig-administration of Great Britain, as this gave stability to the connexions, which had been formed with powerful individuals.

The first, who established a great personal interest in the government, was Mr. Boyle, who was afterwards created earl of Shannon. Holding the office of commissioner of the revenue, he was permitted to dispose of the whole patronage of that department, by which he was enabled to attach to himself many followers. By the influence thus acquired he obtained such authority in the house of commons, that Sir Robert Walpole used [10], in his facetious moments, to distinguish him by the title of king of that assembly. It was accordingly found necessary, as has been mentioned, to acquiesce in his desire of obtaining also the office of speaker of the house of commons, which yet more increased his influence.

The influence of Mr. Boyle was soon checked by the competition of another family, and reduced to a participation in the management of the government. The first shock which it received, was given by the alliances, which the duke of Devonshire, then lord lieutenant, formed with the family of Ponsonby, the borough-interest of that family being by these alliances transferred to the viceroy. Mr. Boyle, piqued at this defection, for that family had before given him support, resigned his office of commissioner, the principal source of his influence over his dependents, which consequently experienced a considerable diminution. His importance, as he held a distinct interest, was finally de-

[10] Plowden's Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 281, note.

stroyed in the year 1756 by a peerage and a pension artfully offered to him for the purpose [11]. From that time the family of Ponsonby became predominant, the former having been reduced to the rank of an accessory.

The inconvenience of this system was sensibly experienced by the British ministry. In its most successful operation it was practically an abdication of the government, which was surrendered almost wholly into the hands of the parliamentary contractors, and resembled the proprietary governments, originally established in some of the colonies of North America. It was also liable to occasional embarrassments. The advantages of the traffic of the undertakers were such, that they tempted new adventurers, and the system was liable to be disturbed by competition. It on the other hand required that popular favour should be conciliated to its support, and it was therefore liable to be agitated by struggles, which the undertakers might deem necessary to their own popularity.

The inconvenience of competition was experienced in the year 1751, when primate Stone [12], who had been connected with the duke of Dorset, then appointed lord lieutenant, laboured to establish an interest in opposition to Mr. Boyle, being supported in the attempt by that nobleman. The immediate consequence of this competition was, that Mr. Boyle exerted his whole influence in opposition to a measure of the government, for appropriating a surplus of the treasury, which he caused to be rejected by a small majority. The government determined to act with vigour on this occasion, all the adherents of Mr. Boyle were dismissed from their employments; but it was after some time judged expedient to have recourse to the conciliatory proposal of the peerage and the pension, which were accordingly offered with success. The primate then made overtures of accommodation to his rival, and formed a triumvirate with the newly created earl of Shannon and with Mr. Ponsonby, the latter of whom had succeeded the former in the chair of the house of commons.

At the accession of George III., the triumvirate, which

[11] At the suggestion of Mr. Carter, the master of the rolls, the patents were at once offered to him, that he might be taken by surprise. The pension was of two thousand pounds for thirty-one years.

[12] Account of Ireland in 1773, p. 29.

had been formed four years before, holding as usual the commission of lords justices, indulged a desire of popularity in a case materially affecting the authority of the crown. In conformity to the law of Poynings a practice had prevailed, that, when a new parliament was to be convened, some bills should be certified by the privy council of Ireland to the ministry of Great Britain, as necessary to be passed in that parliament; and the usage had been that one of the bills so certified should be a bill of supply. This usage it was then proposed to set aside, in favour of the pretension of originating money-bills, which was fondly cherished by the house of commons, as belonging to its true constitutional character. Two letters were accordingly addressed by the lords justices to the duke of Bedford[13], then lord lieutenant, representing in very strong language the expediency of omitting all mention of a money-bill, and the latter of them tendering a resignation of the commission, if the usage of certifying such a bill should not be abandoned. The government was firm, and the triumvirate yielded; the money-bill was not omitted, and the lords justices did not resign their places. The orator, improperly denominated *single-speech* Hamilton, seems to have on this occasion exhibited the first display of cultivated eloquence in the parliament of Ireland.

Such a system of government had a natural tendency towards a profuse expenditure of the public money, for which the circumstances of Ireland afforded an opportunity. When Charles II. resigned his right to a share of the Irish forfeitures[14], that he might facilitate the act of settlement, an hereditary revenue was in compensation settled on the crown. This was so abundant[15], that it for some time furnished a considerable surplus, which was annually remitted to the king. On the accession of George II.[16], the hereditary re-

[13] Subjoined to Parliamentary Logic by the Hon. W. G. Hamilton.

[14] Clarendon's Sketch of the Revenue and Finances of Ireland, pp. 7, 8. Lond. and Dubl., 1791. [15] Account of Ireland in 1773, p. 13. It consisted of several particulars of little value, anciently established, but chiefly of the duties of tonnage and poundage, originally settled in the year 1500, and after the restoration confirmed and increased, together with various others, which arose to an annual income of 300,000*l*.—Ibid. Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. iii. p. 169.

[16] Account of Ireland in 1773, p. 27.

venue was augmented by additional duties, which amounted to about a third part of the former fund. Such a provision became more than adequate to the expenditure, when the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, concluded in the year 1748, had given occasion to an increase of trade. A large unappropriated sum was accordingly found in the treasury, and it was about the mode of disposing of a part of this surplus, that Mr. Boyle, in the year 1753, successfully opposed the government. It seems then to have been determined[17], that such a subject of contention should not continue to exist. All the friends and dependents of the parliamentary leaders were encouraged to present petitions for the bounty of the public, under the pretence of promoting manufactures, or other beneficial undertakings; and so successful was this expedient, that within four or five years the government, from having a redundant revenue, and an unappropriated treasure of nearly five hundred thousand pounds, was reduced to the necessity of borrowing three hundred and fifty thousand.

The schemes proposed for removing the embarrassing redundancy of the treasury, were of the most various kinds, and form a most extraordinary aggregate of projects. Bounties were devised on fish, fishing-busses, and whale-catching[18]; county-hospitals and coal-yards were at other times recommended; and the establishment of public granaries, with premiums for corn preserved on stands[19], was also pressed on the attention of parliament. So avowed and notorious was the system, that the committee[20], to which these applications were referred, was distinguished by the title of 'the scrambling committee;' and in the debates of the year 1763 we find a member of the house of commons openly declaring, that he did not see, why he should not have his job done, as well as another[21]. But the measure, which was most effectual in disburdening the government of an inconvenient redundancy, was the grant of a bounty for all corn and flour conveyed to Dublin by land-carriage, which within a few years amounted to an annual expendi-

[17] Account of Ireland in 1773, pp. 108, 109. [18] Ibid., p. 44. [19] Debates in 1763 and 1764, vol. ii. p. 571. [20] Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. iii. p. 181. [21] This was a scheme of encouraging a cotton-manufactory at Donnybrook near Dublin.

ture of fifty thousand pounds[22]. This indeed was a beneficial measure, for it relieved the country from a dependence on imported grain by the encouragement of domestic tillage; but the necessity of it may be traced to the illegal and dishonest resolution of the house of commons[23], which in the year 1735 had proscribed the tithe of *agistment*, or pasturage, and had thus given an annual premium against tillage.

Many of these schemes doubtless were chimerical, and much of the money of the public was improvidently expended; but the jobbing system appears notwithstanding to have been productive of other advantages, besides that of rendering the government dependent on the parliament for supplies, as in England had been done by the profligate expenditure of Charles II. In a country, in which so many causes had co-operated to crush the efforts of commercial industry, those accumulations of private capital, which constitute an important part of the machinery of commerce, could not easily be formed. In the progress of time indeed such accumulations would have been made, but the process would have been slow, and the only present substitute was to pour into the enterprises of individuals the overflowing of the public revenue.

It is remarkable that the corn-bounty is described[24] as having been forced upon the lord lieutenant by a new set of men, who, in the progressive changes of the Irish government, were then rising into importance. These were the patriots, whose leaders on this occasion were Mr. Perry and Sir Lucius O'Brien. While the undertakers grew upon the English interest of primate Boulter, a lower and more popular party was gradually acquiring a strength, which threatened to overpower them in turn. This indeed was the natu-

[22] Account of Ireland in 1773, pp. 36, 37. [23] This resolution operated as law, to the prejudice of the protestant church, until the question of the union was brought forward in the parliament. It having been then urged, as an objection to the union, that the measure would involve the restoration of the tithe of agistment, the government brought forward a law to remove the difficulty by enacting the formal abolition of it. The tithe is now, after an intervening arrangement of an acreable composition, converted into a rent-charge on the land, but with a sacrifice of a fourth part to gain the consent of the landlords.

[24] Account of Ireland in 1773, pp. 36, 37.

ral progress of the government. It was natural that these, who were not comprehended within the beneficial patronage of the parliamentary leaders, should look to the people for support; and, if those leaders should ever be engaged in a contest among themselves, or with the government, the regular opposition would receive a temporary reinforcement. It accordingly happened that a small number of country-gentlemen, not exceeding seventeen, formed a regular minority in the house of commons, not distinguished by any display of talent, and just sufficient to maintain a spirit of independence for a favourable occasion. It also happened that, when primate Stone engaged in a struggle with Mr. Boyle, the latter with his party filled the ranks of opposition, and exhibited the encouraging example of a successful resistance.

The strenuous and systematic struggle of opposition was begun by doctor Charles Lucas, an obscure but intelligent individual, who had endeared himself to his fellow-citizens of Dublin by a spirit, which could not be overborne, and by an integrity, which could not be seduced. His powers indeed were not of a class fitted for making any considerable impression in the house of commons. Destitute of the advantages of a liberal education[25], he was much more distinguished as a leader of corporations, than as a senator. The time however for making a great impression in parliament had not arrived. The spirit of independence was to be nurtured in an order, which lay beyond the precincts of influence and intrigue; and the parliamentary efforts of Lucas, inadequate as they were to present victory, were sufficient for exciting the attention, and encouraging the exertions of the public. He was not the disciplined combatant, who should make regular and effectual approaches; but he may be considered as the forlorn hope of parliamentary opposition, exploring for others with an adventurous, but desperate gallantry, the path of conquest.

The first exertion, by which Lucas became known to the public, was made in the common council of the city of Dublin, in which he combated the municipal usurpations of the aldermen. On account of the spirit, which he had manifested

[25] Hardy's Life of the Earl of Charlemont, pp. 160, 161. London, 1810.

in this struggle, he was in the year 1749 invited by his fellow-citizens to represent them in parliament, the deaths of both their representatives having afforded a favourable opportunity. He was not however permitted to take his seat on this occasion, being attacked by a persecution, which seems to have prepared him for acting on this larger theatre with greater distinction, by investing him with the importance of one, who had suffered for the people. Passages were selected from his writings[26], on which was founded a charge brought against him by the house of commons; and that assembly, with the headlong violence of party, at once addressed the lord lieutenant to cause him to be prosecuted, and prejudged the cause by voting that he was an enemy to his country. Lucas, aware that the favour of the people was not sufficient for his protection, fled from his adversaries, and remained some time in exile. A parliament being convened soon after the accession of George III., he was again elected, and was then admitted to take his place. From this time he continued, without any interruption, to indulge his independent spirit.

The party of the patriots, if unassisted, must have experienced much greater difficulty in the struggle with the undertakers, than that had encountered from the English interest, for the patriots had to contend with domestic adversaries, supported by numerous partisans. The undertakers therefore, if the struggle had been left wholly to the two parties, might have maintained a protracted, and even doubtful resistance. It happened however that they were not less obnoxious to the government, than to the patriots. Government, says an anonymous writer of that period[27], disliked this system, because these men sometimes opposed, and the nation disliked it, because they generally complied with the minister. The undertakers were thus placed between two enemies, the government and the people; and either of these enemies might naturally expect to receive some co-operation from the other.

Early in the period of the undertakers occurred one short, but luminous interval, which just exhibited to the people of

[26] Plowden's Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 304. [27] Barataria na, p. 337. Dubl., 1773; a satire on the government of lord Townshend, as viceroy of the island of Sancho Pancha.

Ireland a specimen of a better administration. The government of the earl of Chesterfield[28], which was long remembered with respect, began and ended with the Scotish rebellion of the year 1745. In that short interval of less than eight months, without negotiating for the support of the factions of parliament, he found that he possessed the confidence of the legislature; without offending the Protestants he conciliated the Roman Catholics by a liberal toleration; and such security did he establish in Ireland, while a rebellion was raging in Britain, that he was able to send four battalions to the assistance of the duke of Cumberland. This security he established by encouraging the formation of military corps of volunteers[29], anticipating, in this instance, the particular measure, to which Ireland was afterwards indebted for her independence.

Mr. Plowden has anxiously pointed out the recall of this nobleman, as an indication of the reluctance, with which an administration so beneficial was conceded by the British government. A fairer explanation, of which too this writer was himself aware, might be collected from a consideration of the powerful interests, which that administration had controlled. These might yield during a season of alarm, but would recover all their energy, when the danger had ceased to menace. Neither could any secure reliance be at that time placed on the loyalty of the Roman Catholics, however tranquil they appeared to be during the struggle of the Scotish adherents of the pretender. They were then too much weakened to be forward in the contest, and therefore might be well disposed to await the issue[30]; but it is now known that their whole hierarchy was, directly or indirectly, nominated by that very claimant of the throne, in support of whom England was then invaded.

[28] Plowden's Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 300. [29] Ibid., p. 296.

[30] This however they did with intense anxiety. Of this the writer has received the following proof. The conveyance of the mails was then so imperfect, that, as the late earl of Charlemont informed him, no despatches had been received by the government from England during three weeks. In that interval, as the late doctor Moody told the writer, when doctor M'Conchy, who resorted to the Globe Coffee-house, then frequented by Roman Catholics, expressed in that place his solicitude about the state of affairs, a Roman Catholic told him, that he might set his mind at ease, for the business had been decided.

Omitting all further consideration of this anomalous government, which began and ended with a particular crisis of the empire, we discover[31] in that of the duke of Bedford, who was nominated lord lieutenant in the year 1757, the first disposition of the British ministry to throw off the trammels of the undertakers, and establish independently of them the influence of government. The effort was however but transient[32]. After a short struggle the duke was compelled to submit to the bondage of his predecessors, and the undertakers were reinstated in their former authority. In the year 1766 the earl of Bristol was nominated chief governor[33], avowedly for the purpose of breaking up that system; but the parliamentary leaders mustered their forces, and displayed so strong a determination to embarrass his government, that he shrunk from the enterprise. The resignation of that nobleman made room for lord Townshend, who entered upon the government in the year 1767.

This chief governor was sent, not to raise up a popular interest on the ruin of an oligarchy, but to establish on it the influence of the British government. Popularity was to be employed in overthrowing the existing system, but yet in subordination to the scheme of maintaining the control of Great Britain. The result however was not such, as had been expected. The Irish oligarchy was reduced, but, instead of establishing on its ruin the ascendency of Great Britain, preparation was undesignedly made for the subsequent efforts, which procured an independent constitution for Ireland. This was all, of which Ireland was then ca-

[31] Account of Ireland in 1773, p. 36. [32] An attempt was on this occasion made to effect the change by accusation; but on enquiry it was found that, during the last ten years, the revenue had been improved, and the expenditure diminished, in comparison with the ten preceding. Mr. Ponsonby therefore, who had been the object of the proposed accusation, received the unanimous thanks of the house of commons. This particular was candidly communicated to the author by his late friend, the right honourable Sackville Hamilton, who in an advanced period of life had been dismissed from his office by the party, with which the family of Mr. Ponsonby acted, after a long series of public services, and without any imputation of misconduct. The author may now boast that from this candid, intelligent, and respected friend, he received much useful assistance, in investigating the embarrassed history of Irish party. [33] Account of Ireland in 1773, pp. 42, 126, 149, &c.

pable. Neither the means, nor the opportunity, of Irish independence then existed; and, though a different system of administration might at that time have thinned the ranks of the opposition, yet for that very reason it might have in a less degree contributed to excite the spirit, which afterwards vindicated the rights of the country.

In the hope of conciliating the popular favour, lord Townshend intimated[34], soon after his arrival, that he had been empowered to propose a measure, which would be most acceptable to the people. It was conjectured, that the meditated benefit was a limitation of the duration of the parliament, which had been four times proposed to the government in vain; but it was discovered to be a bill for securing the independence of the judges. The former measure was however proposed by Henry Flood; and by a singular combination of circumstances it happened, that the measure of the people became a law, while the proffered boon of the government was rejected. An alteration had in England been introduced into the transmitted bill for securing the independence of the judges[35], some words having been added, apparently for the purpose of leading the Irish parliament into an acquiescence in the pretension of the British government. When the alteration was discovered, the bill, though acknowledged to be beneficial, was on a constitutional principle unanimously rejected. The other bill, for limiting the duration of the parliament, had likewise been altered, a period of eight having been substituted for seven years; but this bill was too popular to be sacrificed to the same principle, especially as that principle seemed to have been sufficiently asserted in the other instance. It seems indeed to have been by that popularity forced upon all the parties concerned in the enactment. The parliamentary leaders had probably hoped, that the bill would be again suppressed by the privy council, to which it was necessarily sent for transmission to England: the privy council, jealous of the popularity of the parliament, had resolved to trust to the British cabinet for its rejection: the British cabinet seems to have relied on the alteration, for causing it to be rejected, when it should have been sent back to the Irish parliament.

[34] Baratariana, letter 2. [35] Plowden's Hist. Review, vol. i. p. 388, note.

This law, which was enacted in the year 1768, must be regarded as constituting an important epoch in the constitutional history of Ireland, its parliamentary institution having been before destitute of any limitation of time, except that of the life of the sovereign. When William assembled his first parliament in Ireland, twenty-six years had elapsed without any session, the hereditary revenue, as increased soon after the restoration, having been sufficient for defraying the expenses of the government. The parliament then convened, having caught from the revolution an inconvenient spirit of independence, was speedily dissolved, and a new one was assembled about two years afterwards. The people, having first suffered a long interruption of the meetings of the legislature, and having then witnessed an abrupt dissolution, which was at no long interval followed by another election, were not taught, in this period of constitutional struggle, to regard with jealousy the continuance of the trust of representation, and seem not to have thought at that time of limiting its duration. On the other hand, during the general predominance of the Whigs, and especially when, at the accession of the first prince of the family of Brunswick, they were settled in the possession of power, the Protestants, who were then the people, were disposed to maintain, as much as possible, the impulse which had been given to the administration of the government. As therefore in Great Britain the possible existence of the parliament was, on the first favourable occasion, extended from three to seven years, so in Ireland, where no limitation had been previously established, the parliament began to be continued during the life of the sovereign, being regularly assembled in the alternate years. When however this practice had been observed during two successive reigns, the latter of which had comprehended thirty-three years, the public began to be sensible of the imperfection of a system, which might remove to so great a distance the season of responsibility, especially as an independent opposition had at length been formed, strong enough to attract attention to popular measures, though not able to overcome the resistance of a parliamentary oligarchy. We find accordingly in the debates of the years 1763 and 1764 a proposal for limiting the duration of a parliament, together with other measures of a

similar tendency, introduced into the house of commons. Repeated efforts were ineffectually exerted for accomplishing an improvement so important, until at length the government of lord Townshend co-operated with the increasing anxiety of the public, to reduce to its proper character the representative part of the Irish constitution, and thus to lay the foundation of the future liberty of Ireland.

The subsequent government of this nobleman was employed in removing out of the way of freedom the obstructions of powerful combinations, while he sought only to aggrandise the crown. The first lord lieutenant constantly resident in Ireland, he was able to negotiate for himself all the arrangements necessary to the public business. He could watch every opportunity of detaching individuals from the great leaders of the parliament, and strengthening the party of the castle; and he soon succeeded in leaving in an ineffectual opposition those very persons, who had dictated to his predecessors the hard conditions of their support. The undertakers of that period were the earl of Shannon and Mr. Ponsonby, whose families had become connected, and the duke of Leinster, who had joined himself to their association. The earl of Shannon and Mr. Ponsonby were dismissed from their employments in the year 1769, on account of the successful resistance, which they had given to a money-bill, originated according to usage in the privy council; and in the year 1771 the latter resigned his office of speaker of the house of commons, when the influence of the lord lieutenant had procured from that assembly a complimentary address, which it would have been his duty to deliver.

In this struggle the expenditure of the public money was profuse, for it was a contest of venality; and yet the lord lieutenant was more than once disposed to abandon his enterprise in despair, and persevered only because his spirit had been piqued by his adversaries. On one of these occasions he remarked, with his characteristic facetiousness, that he had supposed his antagonists to be too good sportsmen, to make him double back, when they saw him just going to break cover.

According to those, whom lord Townshend displaced and drove into opposition, he was an intemperate and incapable

buffoon, debasing private manners by a contempt of decorum, and destroying public principle by an extreme grossness of corruption. The individuals on the other hand, to whom he attached himself, long commemorated his birthday with an affectionate recollection, which seems to indicate a more honourable sentiment, than the gratitude of self-interest. In the last of those letters indeed[36], which have emulated the severity and the genius of the English Junius, we find an admission of the exaggeration, which such an imitation would naturally occasion; and in one of those addressed to his successors we meet a reluctant acknowledgment[37], that his character, all odious as it was described, was yet occasionally irradiated by the brilliancy of genius, and animated by the warmth of feeling. Even the extraordinary levity of his character may have co-operated to the development of Irish freedom. He was the first viceroy, who resided constantly in Ireland during his government; and his habits and his intimacies, though they may have conciliated the attachment of individuals, and attracted the applause of the populace, were ill qualified to invest with an imposing splendour the perennial exhibition of a delegated royalty.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of the history of Ireland, from the end of the government of lord Townshend in the year 1772 *to the end of that of lord Northington in the year* 1784.

The American war begun in the year 1775—The first act for the relief of the Roman Catholics, 1778—The volunteer army formed, 1779—Freedom of trade—The test-act repealed, 1780—The first convention at Dungannon, and the legislative independence of Ireland, 1782—The second convention at Dungannon, and the national convention at Dublin, 1783.

THE spirit of Irish liberty was manifested almost immediately after the termination of the government of lord

[36] Baratariana, p. 353. [37] Ibid., p. 342.

Townshend. That nobleman having retired from Ireland in the year 1772, the speaker of the house of commons, at the close of the following year, declared to his successor, lord Harcourt, the expectation of that assembly, that those restrictions should be removed[1], by which Great Britain had confined the commercial industry of Ireland. The government of this other viceroy indeed exhibited a very remarkable development of all the principles, which have actuated its later policy. The claim of commercial freedom was strongly and repeatedly urged by the speaker in his official addresses; the spirit of political jealousy was displayed in rejecting a proposal of substituting foreign mercenaries, though at the expense of Great Britain, for the troops withdrawn from Ireland to serve against the Americans; and in this same government the British minister commenced the system of improving the condition of the Roman Catholics by mitigating the severities of the penal code, under which they had languished since the reign of Anne. The government of lord Townshend had terminated the oligarchical administration of the Irish government; that of lord Harcourt unfolded those germs of political energy, which were soon to expand themselves into national prosperity and importance.

From the time when a redundancy of the treasury had excited a contest between the crown and the parliament, the latter seems to have determined to prevent a recurrence of the evil by an extraordinary profuseness of expenditure; and afterwards, in the government of lord Townshend, as we have since been informed by the late earl of Clare, the half of a million was lavished in reducing the power of the oligarchy, by corrupting the parliament. By the united operation of the extravagance of the parliament in granting premiums and bounties, and of that of the viceroy in procuring adherents for the government, the redundancy of about the half of a million was, within twenty-three years, converted into a debt of nearly a million[2]. When the

[1] Ireland was first restrained from a free trade with the colonies by the act of the fifteenth year of Charles II. A similar jealousy had, immediately after the restoration, excluded the Scots from the right of naturalisation, which they had enjoyed in England since the accession of James I. [2] 931,690*l.* 1*s.* 9½*d.*—Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 129.

country was so deeply embarrassed, the public revenue became insufficient for the expenditure, and the government was reduced to the ruinous expedient of successive loans.

While the financial embarrassment of Ireland was thus tending towards bankruptcy, the war of America, that vancourier of the revolutions of the world, added its twofold agency, in deranging by the interruption of commerce the resources of individuals, and at the same time in powerfully exciting by its example the spirit of the people. This was the first consequence of that primary revolution, which has since, by its more extended influence, convulsed the system of Europe, and given independence to the American settlements of Spain and Portugal.

The exportation of Irish linens to the colonies of North America had been considerable, though the direct trade had been so shackled by prohibiting the exportation of American goods[3], received in return, that this commerce had been managed almost wholly by the English. This resource was at once cut off by the war. The trade of provisions was also wholly suspended by an embargo, which was continued several years, the alleged object being to hinder the supply of the colonists of America, but the operation extending to France[4], Spain, Portugal, and Holland. Private distress was in this manner superadded to public embarrassment. Every man felt in his own personal concerns, that the situation of Ireland had become extreme; and all ranks and classes of the people were accordingly prepared for receiving any impulse, which should urge them to extricate their country from its difficulties.

The same war, which had consummated the distresses of Ireland, afforded also the impulse of her independence. When France had most unwisely resolved to unite her forces with those of the British colonies, for supporting them in their plan of independence, the naval superiority of the enemies of Great Britain caused the maritime towns of Ireland to make application to the government for protection against invasion. The government[5], unable to afford assistance, told them that they must protect themselves. Corps were accordingly embodied, armed, and disciplined by the people,

[3] Commercial Restraints of Ireland, pp. 179—183. [4] Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 139. [5] Ibid., p. 166.

and at their own expense; and Ireland, through all its provinces, but more especially in the north, exhibited the animated spectacle of an armed nation. 'You have sown the serpent's teeth,' said Hussey Burgh, the orator of the day, to the bench of ministers, 'and they have sprung up armed men.' The allusion indeed was more apposite than he intended it to be, for the gallant spectacle concealed the principle of future dissension.

The war of America was not an ordinary contest, but a struggle for a principle; and the sympathetic influence of that principle was felt by the people of Ireland, even while they armed themselves for their defence against the enemies, which the struggle had brought against their country, as a part of the empire. 'A voice from America,' to use the animated language of Mr. Flood[6], 'shouted to liberty.' The shout was eagerly caught by an impoverished people, who saw so close an analogy in their own calamities; and armed as they were for their own defence, they felt that they possessed the power of causing their interests to be consulted by the common government.

The British minister, lord North, was not unwilling to concede such advantages of commerce, as might be necessary for relieving the distresses of Ireland, and appears to have actually proposed to permit for this purpose some considerable enlargements of its trade[7]. His intentions however were so strenuously resisted by the active jealousy of the trading-towns of Great Britain, that it became necessary that the people of Ireland should present themselves in an attitude, which might excite among the British traders apprehensions yet more alarming, than of the inconvenience of a participated commerce. In this crisis appeared the self-armed, self-embodied volunteers. They demanded their rights, and the angry jealousies of monopolizing traders were at once reduced to silence.

The volunteer-army of Ireland was the creature of a sudden emergency, acting upon the energies of an ill-governed country. When the minister proposed to withdraw for the

[6] The remainder of the sentence was: 'the people caught the sound, as it crossed the Atlantic; and they continued it, till it reverberated here.' [7] Knox's Extra-Official State-Papers, app., part i. pp. 86, &c.

war of America four thousand of the regulated forces of Ireland, and to substitute for them as many foreign Protestants, without requiring the country to defray the expense of these troops, the four thousand men were readily granted by the Irish parliament, but, with a spirit ominous of approaching liberty, the offer of the gratuitous protection of foreign mercenaries was rejected. The military strength of the government was in this manner considerably reduced. The lord lieutenant on the other hand declared to the parliament[8], that the exhausted state of the public resources had rendered it impracticable to embody a militia, which, though a civic army, would have been commanded by officers appointed by the government, and subject to its control. When therefore the country was menaced with invasion, the people were told by the government that they must protect themselves. They obeyed the call with the alacrity of brave men, and under all the pressure of public and private embarrassment, a numerous and well appointed army was speedily arrayed[9]. The government of that day thought not of the importance of endeavouring to maintain a control over the men, who were thus exhorted to embody themselves in arms. Though it still affected to wield the sceptre of dominion, it had transferred to its subjects the sword of protection; and the volunteer army of Ireland, while it defied the foreign enemies of the country, could not fail to be conscious, that it was the army of the people, and possessed the power of vindicating their rights.

It was the fortune of the British minister of this period to favour the rise of independence by the very measures, which he employed for its suppression. While the popular spirit of resistance was, like a contagion, spreading through every rank, and even weakening the attachment of the habitual supporters of the government, he thought proper to introduce alterations into two transmitted money-bills, thereby offending the jealousy of the parliament in that important particular, in which alone it had continued to exist. The question of taxation too being the great question at issue with America, it seemed as if it had been his wish to create

[8] Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 165. [9] In the year 1779 it amounted to forty-two thousand men, and was afterwards much augmented.—Plowden, vol. i. pp. 492, 529.

an occasion for establishing in regard to the nearer country the same right, for which he was then contending with a distant dependency. His speculation, if he entertained it, proved to be as erroneous in respect of Ireland, as in respect of the colonies. His altered money-bills were rejected by the Irish parliament, the friends of the government having been by this unseasonable effort of authority induced to connect themselves with its adversaries in one unanimous opposition.

Such was in the year 1779 the deficiency of the Irish treasury, that the country had become dependent on Great Britain for the subsistence of the remaining regular forces[10], and actually received for this purpose fifty thousand pounds. This was the crisis of the public distress, and of the public deliverance. At this time it was, that the eloquence of Grattan kindled the flame of freedom in the breasts of the parliament, and the Irish commons explicitly declared to the government of the two countries, that no temporary expedients, but a free trade alone, could save the nation from the ruin, with which it was threatened. The parliament, faithful to the spirit thus excited, proceeded to enforce this declaration by the menacing measure of granting the supplies only for the short period of six months.

The minister was alarmed, and he determined to conciliate by concession. It seems however as if his concessions were fated to offend, instead of gratifying. His commercial concessions, though unsatisfactory to a country demanding a free trade, were as liberal, as the jealousy of the British traders would then permit; but we must ascribe to himself the folly of introducing alterations into bills transmitted in a period of extreme agitation and excitement. The bills altered on this occasion were not, as in the former instance, money-bills. That folly he did not venture to repeat. But one of them was a bill involving the dearest interests of the people, and the alteration was such, as gave to the public mind the only impulse, which it then required to receive, for aspiring to constitutional independence. The Irish parliament, not choosing that its military establishment should be longer regulated by a British mutiny-law, transmitted a bill of a similar import. The minister, as if eager to in-

[10] Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 165.

demnify himself for commercial concession by constitutional spoliation, introduced an alteration, by which the law was to be rendered perpetual; and the Irish parliament, though it passed the bill thus altered, was taught to look to freedom of constitution, as the necessary safeguard of freedom of trade, to assert its own independence, while it unfettered the commerce of the country. When the minister had first, by the altered money-bills, alarmed the constitutional jealousy of the guardians of the public purse, he had then, by another alteration rendering the mutiny-law perpetual, manifested a desire of securing to the government the uncontrolled direction of the military power. No language could more explicitly, or more forcibly, exhort the people of Ireland, to be satisfied with no concessions merely commercial, but to insist that Ireland should be acknowledged as an independent, though not a separated state.

By the eloquence of Grattan whatever was yet wanted for confirming the new-formed patriotism of the habitual supporters of the government, was at once supplied. The glowing ardour of the national sentiment was poured into the senate in its most concentrated and potent form, and the selfish speculations of private interest withered before it. For such an occasion eloquence of a peculiar species was required, and the eloquence of this distinguished man was peculiar. The masterly character of the illustrious Chatham, which has been attributed to him, represents the eloquence of that great minister, as resembling neither the torrent of Demosthenes, nor the splendid conflagration of Tully. The same distinctions may be applied to the eloquence of the Irish orator. But neither can it be said to correspond to the description of that of lord Chatham, as familiar and spontaneous. His office was not to rouse to the call of glory a people enervated by the affluence of commerce, and by the indolence of peace. The occasion therefore required not an eloquence fitted to awaken the dormant energies of the human heart. The public mind had been already excited by agencies numerous and powerful. The eloquence demanded by the occasion was such, as might give force and impression to principles already acknowledged and felt. That of the father of Irish independence was accordingly sententious and poignant, not

flashing a new conviction on the dazzled mind, but deeply and permanently impressing the truths, of which every hearer was already, though less cogently, convinced. Perhaps this very peculiar eloquence cannot be more aptly characterised, than by the observation, which Cicero has recorded concerning the Grecian Pericles, that he left stings in the mind of his hearers[11].

It was among the felicities of Ireland, that it should at this time possess such an organ, for transfusing into its parliament the spirit of its people. It was also its good fortune, that its self-created armament should find a leader, with whom its interests were secure from violation. That leader was the earl of Charlemont, whose political life was commensurate with the independence, as it was devoted to the interests of his country. With the early efforts of the independent Lucas we find his name associated; the meridian glory of the volunteers encircled with its splendour his pure and dignified patriotism; and he seemed to sink into the grave at the prospect of the incorporating union, which terminated the political independence of a country so long, and so sincerely cherished. Though alive to the dignity of exalted rank, he had never been led to engage himself in the cabals of an oligarchy; though sensible to the gratification of enjoying the affections of the people, he could resolve to risk his popularity, when they would have advanced beyond the limit, which he conceived to be prescribed by genuine patriotism. The conciliating elegance of his manners was characteristic of the balanced temper of his mind; and Mr. Burke once remarked to the author, that he was the only man within his knowledge, Mr. Fox not excepted, whom a love of popularity had not vulgarised. Yielding at an early age[12], to the call of duty, he resided in the metropolis of Ireland, where he was then less connected than in any other capital in Europe, and where he could not then find those objects of art and refinement, by which

[11] Tantam in eo vim fuisse, ut in eorum mentibus, qui audissent, quasi aculeos quosdam relinqueret.—De Oratore, lib. iii. cap. xxxiv.

[12] This brief account of the political life of the earl of Charlemont was given by himself to the author, when he was lamenting the incorporating union, which in his judgment blasted all hope of the prosperity of Ireland,

he had been accustomed to be interested. There, and in its vicinity, he lavished his fortune in building, that he might create for himself an interest, which he saw nothing around him fitted to supply; and, while he watched over the political interests of his country, he laboured, by the institution, and the unwearied support, of an academy, to introduce habits of reflection and enquiry among a convivially dissipated people.

While the British parliament had separated, early in the year 1779, without satisfying the expectations of the Irish, and the parliament of Ireland was, by a long recess[13], withheld from the consideration of the public grievances, the national spirit was left to work out its own deliverance. In this interruption of domestic, and neglect of external legislation, was arrayed the volunteer army, eager to defend the country from invasion, but irritated at the disregard of its sufferings, which had been manifested by the government. When military associations had been formed in every part of Ireland, the tendency towards union, natural to men engaged in a common cause, and not yet separated by any repugnance of political principles, was speedily exhibited. In the following year they began to assemble in large bodies for reviews, by which, while their strength was ostentatiously displayed to admiring multitudes, they acquired confidence in themselves, and were led to communicate and co-operate for political purposes. At length, in the year 1782, was convened at Dungannon the memorable meeting of the delegates of the volunteer associations of the northern province, in which was framed the decisive exposition of the demands of Ireland.

The earl of Harcourt had, in the year 1777, been succeeded in the government of Ireland by the earl of Buckinghamshire; and this nobleman had himself, in the year 1780, been succeeded by the earl of Carlisle. It was remarked by the late earl of Clare, that the imbecility of lord Buckinghamshire had arrayed the volunteer army. The object of the government of his successor appears to have been to repress the spirit, which had begun to be regarded with alarm. It actually excited that spirit to new

[13] From the second of September in the year 1780 to the ninth of October in the year 1781.—Collectanea Politica, vol. i. pp. 184, 187.

and more energetic exertions. When the armed people of Ireland saw, that their representatives had begun to resume their former tone, and to negative every proposal for establishing a free constitution, they felt that they must rely upon themselves for the attainment of their object. The call for a provincial convention was then uttered by one corps, and eagerly answered by the rest; and the resolutions of Dungannon, urged by the eloquence of Grattan, restored to the parliament the unanimity of the year 1779, and effected the legislative independence of Ireland. The question of a free trade had been carried in the government of lord Buckinghamshire, the indecision of that viceroy having given to the measure the appearance of being favoured by the government [14].

The war, which had created the critical embarrassment of the trade of Ireland, and had at the same time exhibited the animating example of a struggle for independence, at length by its disasters displaced the ministry of Great Britain, and substituted for it the leaders of a party, which in opposition had advocated the cause of freedom. This change having occurred within a few weeks after the meeting of Dungannon, the representation, which arose from the resolutions framed at that meeting, was received in a willing parliament, and the free constitution of Ireland, destined to so short an existence, was voted by acclamation in the one country, and conceded without restrictions or conditions in the other.

To the popular view everything in Ireland was at this time brilliant and triumphant. The energies of a whole people had been excited by domestic distress and foreign danger; and these energies, while they effectually protected the country from external insult, had been successfully directed to the attainment of the most important objects of commerce and constitution. The interests of the country were however, even in this moment of gratification, beset by the most alarming dangers. An armed people had dic-

[14] When that question was agitated in the house of commons, there were just forty-seven members known to be favourable to the measure; but Mr. Conolly, brother-in-law to the lord lieutenant, having spoken in favour of it, the secretary, Sir R. Heron, having sat silent and inefficient, and Mr. Clements, who held a considerable office, having then recommended it, the house supposed that it was favoured by the government, and it was carried.

tated to the parliaments of the two countries. The forms of the government were preserved, for the lords and commons authenticated the measures, by which it was exercised; but it was distinctly felt, that the volunteer associations possessed a power independent of the government, and capable of controlling its operations.

Perhaps no other history can boast an example of so great a power, brought to act with effect on the existing government of a country, and, when its proper purpose had been attained, relaxing itself again by degrees into a civil subordination and tranquillity, indispensable to the preservation of the public welfare. The volunteer army of Ireland has on this account, even more than for its spirit of independence, been the subject of merited encomium. Instead of the intemperance of triumph, advancing beyond the limit of sober exertion, and eager to manifest its superiority by successive changes of the government, the military was rapidly transformed into the civic character, an armed multitude appearing to be actuated only by a rational desire of enjoying the advantages, which it had obtained.

Much of this merit is doubtless to be ascribed to the soundness of the disposition, by which the volunteers had been originally prompted. The grievances of Ireland had been numerous and oppressive, and the crisis, which called the volunteers into action, had been sudden and urgent. A desire of removing real and obvious evils was accordingly the only disposition, which the occasion was fitted to generate, or the time had permitted to take possession of the public mind. The principles too of the Irish volunteers had been received from the British constitution, for the corrupted monarchy of France had not yet engendered the wild democracy, which soon afterwards infested the world. Though there existed among them an instinctive tendency to maintain their importance, and to seek further advantages, yet it operated but feebly on the whole body controlled as it was by the habit of orderly submission to authority.

The volunteer army however contained within itself a principle of division and debility, which naturally tended to paralyse its exertions, when its original objects had been attained. It had been formed out of a divided people, and

was necessarily affected by their divisions. The Presbyterians of the northern province, though most opposed in religious tenets to the majority of the people, and in the year 1780 relieved from the disqualification of the test-act, were impelled by a more vehement love of general liberty, to seek in the enfranchisement of the Roman Catholics, an augmentation of the popular power. Many Roman Catholics, on the other hand, had been permitted to arm themselves for the emergency of the national defence; the sympathy of a common cause had overcome much of the alienation, which had hitherto repelled them from the confidence of Protestants; and many of the latter had even begun to consider them as justly entitled to participate the advantages of that constitution, which they had assisted to vindicate. In these circumstances a party favourable to the Roman Catholics was gradually formed in the army of the Protestants, and accordingly, among the resolutions adopted at Dungannon, satisfaction was expressed at the advantages, which four years before had been granted to that description of their fellow-subjects[15].

This new party did not begin to produce any actual division, until more than two years had passed since the convention of Dungannon, when, in an address presented by the northern volunteers to their general, the earl of Charlemont, it was intimated, that it was expedient to invite the assistance of the Roman Catholics, as indispensably necessary to the attainment of their grand object, a reformation of the house of commons. That nobleman, however, gratified as he was by the attachment of his civic soldiers, did not hesitate to declare in his reply, that his principles did not permit him to connect the cause of reform with that of the Roman Catholics. From that moment the volunteers became a divided and enfeebled body. A national convention of the volunteer army was indeed soon

[15] The question of the relief of the Roman Catholics of Ireland was in the year 1778 first brought forward by the government, agreeably to the example of the British parliament. To defeat it a clause was added, repealing the sacramental test; but the bill was returned without the clause. By this law Roman Catholics were permitted to hold lands by leases for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, a tenure prescribed for the exclusion of the elective franchise, which was not conceded until the year 1793. The Presbyterians were in the year 1780 relieved from the sacramental test.

afterwards assembled by delegation in the capital; but that army, in losing its unanimity, had lost its strength and importance. Many, and among these some of its most respectable members, chose to absent themselves from the meeting[16]; and, when its attempt to effect by intimidation a reform of the house of commons was encountered by a firm resistance, the assembly was adjourned to meet no more.

While this dissension was neutralising the energy of the general body, another was diminishing the importance of its parliamentary leaders. This related to the constitutional advantage already obtained, for the question of the political enfranchisement of the Roman Catholics was not yet brought before the parliament.

Mr. Grattan, in the fervour of his gratitude for the advantages obtained by his country, moved an address to the king, in which, with the blindness of human confidence, he ventured to assure his Majesty, that no question of constitution could thenceforward exist between the two nations, capable of interrupting their harmony. Two persons only dissented from this expression of entire satisfaction; but the question concerning the sufficiency of the simple repeal of the offensive act of George I.[17], which was soon afterwards agitated by Mr. Flood, demonstrated that the adjustment was not perfectly satisfactory, even in regard to that very claim, which it had professed to settle. The act of George I., by which the legislative superiority of the parliament of Great Britain in regard to Ireland had been declared, was repealed in the year 1782, agreeably to the requisition of Mr. Grattan. Mr. Flood however contended that, as the act of George I. had been merely declaratory, the simple repeal of that act but withdrew an offensive declaration, without renouncing the principle, and that it was necessary to the security of the rights of Ireland, that the British legislature should formally abandon the claim, which that act had asserted. Mr. Grattan on the other hand maintained the sufficiency of the se-

[16] The military convention, assembled at the Rotunda, committed its resolution to Mr. Flood, who communicated it to the house of commons wearing his volunteer uniform, the convention having in the meantime adjourned its meeting to the next day, that it might receive his report of the reception, which the communication should have experienced.

[17] Passed in the year 1719, commonly named the act of the sixth of George I.

curity already received, resisting the proposal of requiring an explicit renunciation of the principle, as unnecessarily offensive to Great Britain.

Consenting in the desire of establishing the freedom of their country, and differing only about the nature of the security, which it was necessary to obtain, these two distinguished men contended in the same spirit, in which they might have laboured to expose its most abandoned betrayer. The question of the simple repeal, agitated with vehemence and personal animosity, had the effect of breaking down the force of the independent party in the house of commons. Mr. Flood had possessed himself of the post of popularity, and a torrent of public odium was poured upon the man, who had recently been addressed from every side as the saviour of his country, and had justly been deemed worthy of a national grant of fifty thousand pounds.

In these circumstances a decisive blow was given to the volunteer associations, which at that time had fulfilled every purpose compatible with the existence of a regular government. The mandate of the military convention was rejected by the house of commons, as issued by a body unknown to the constitution, and destructive of its freedom; the volunteers, already enfeebled by disunion in regard to the Roman Catholics, sunk under the manifest and alarming irregularity of their national delegation; and the public, seeing in the termination of the war a removal of the original necessity of their services, and in the occupations of peace the opportunity of realising the advantages, which these had procured, beheld with indifference their present disgrace, and subsequent dissolution.

Mr. Flood possessed powerful claims on the affectionate regard of his countrymen. Less conspicuous than Mr. Grattan in the immediate crisis of the liberty of Ireland, he was however entitled to the credit of having asserted the rights of his country in a much earlier period, when his efforts were not equally animated by the voice of the people. He was disgusted at seeing the constitution of Ireland but a shadow of that, which it affected to resemble. The parliaments were continued during entire reigns; the privy councils of both countries were members of the Irish legislature; the judges held their offices only during the pleasure of the

government; no right of *habeas corpus* existed for protection against arbitrary imprisonment; the trade of Ireland was fettered by restrictions even more rigorous than those of a colonial dependency; and the military force, though paid by Ireland, was governed under the mutiny-law of Great Britain. This very imperfect semblance of the British constitution first received an infusion of the spirit of its original, when Mr. Flood successfully pressed the bill for limiting the duration of the parliament; the attack of Poyning's law, which had subjected the parliament to the control of the two privy councils, was commenced by him; when the extension of trade was by the public necessities forced upon the consideration of the government, he was the person, who proposed to reject all modifications, and to demand at once its entire freedom; and, when at length the people were roused to assert the claim of an independent government, he spurned from him a valuable office, and enlisted himself among the champions of liberty. The author has also been informed, that he had first brought into the general meetings of the house of commons the struggle of its parties, which had before been managed wholly in the committee of accounts, so that by him was even begun the practice of disposing of this important business in the freedom of a popular assembly.

With all these pretensions to public favour, Mr. Flood was never eminently popular. When he exerted his earlier efforts for his country, the voice of the people possessed little power; when that voice was afterwards raised to a pitch, which appalled the government, he had been discredited by accepting an official situation. His abandonment of his office should have effaced the unfavourable impression made by his appointment, and even have procured for him the fame of political integrity; but a new candidate had in the interval engaged the attention of the public, leaving for him but a secondary estimation. His eloquence too, though of a high and powerful description, was not equally fitted with that of his competitor, for interesting the public. More anxious to enforce by argument, than to impress by sententiousness, he was often grand, but seldom affecting. His classical admiration was directed to the Grecian orator, but in his practice he seemed rather to have proposed Aristotle as his model; and the recollection of the author is that he

was not so frequently transported by his energy, as he was surprised that so much logic could be expressed with so much eloquence.

Such a man was well qualified to support a division in a popular party, though not to assume a decisive pre-eminence in its measures. The peremptory manhood of his character threw him out from the general combination, and prompted him to take a distinct and peculiar course; his argumentative eloquence, though ill fitted to excite, or to direct, a popular enthusiasm, enforced almost irresistibly the principle, upon which he separated himself from his brother-patriots; and the numerous services of his political life, however depreciated by his temporary accession to the party of the government, commanded no inconsiderable tribute of the respect of his country. During the agitation of the question of the simple repeal he was indeed placed upon the pinnacle of popularity, his rival having sunk even to reprobation; but, when this question was laid at rest by the satisfaction of the public, the basis of his popularity was withdrawn from beneath him, and he yielded the pre-eminence to the restored credit of Mr. Grattan. His popularity was destroyed, when the house of commons rejected the measure of the military convention, which he had undertaken to introduce into that assembly. Even his personal reputation was lowered by his imprudent attempt to display his abilities before the commons of Great Britain, an auditory not accustomed to his peculiarities, and not favourable to his pretensions. At length, almost forgotten by that public, of which he had been for a time the chief favourite, and estranged from every political connexion by the unaccommodating decisiveness of his character, he ended his career in a virtual exclusion from the parliaments of the two countries[18].

In the important change, which had been effected in the situation of Ireland, enough had been done for Irish liberty, but nothing for securing the combination and consistency of the empire. This had become an association of two distinct monarchies, connected by a common executive authority, but actuated by separate legislative wills, and liable

[18] Mr. Grattan survived to sit several years in the imperial parliament after the union, having, as he himself observed, 'sat by the cradle of Irish independence, and followed its hearse.'

to be impelled into mutual opposition[19]. It had been the wish, and was at one time the expectation of the duke of Portland, that the connexion of the two countries should be ascertained by some explicit stipulation of their respective parliaments, which should establish the supremacy of that of Great Britain in regard to all matters of imperial concern, and of general commerce, subjecting Ireland to a rated contribution for the exigencies of war. But he soon saw reason for abandoning the project as impracticable, and the nature of the connexion of the two countries was left to be determined by subsequent events. The spirit of the people was then too much elevated by the triumph of their recent acquisitions, to be capable of entering into negotiation for regulating the commerce, which they had obtained as free, and for modifying the independence, which they had vindicated as complete.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the history of Ireland, from the end of the government of lord Northington in the year 1784, *to the union in the year* 1800.

The commercial adjustment rejected in the year 1785—The question of the regency, 1789—The united Irishmen associated, 1791—The Roman Catholics admitted to the elective franchise, 1793—The association of the united Irishmen became secret. 1794—Completely organised, 1796—The opposition seceded from the parliament, 1797—The rebellion, 1798—The union, 1800—Goldsmith.

It was discovered, in the year 1785, that the regulation of the commercial intercourse of Great Britain and Ireland involved a constitutional question of great importance and difficulty. The free trade, which had been conceded to Ireland, had left undetermined the conditions of that intercourse, which intimately affected various interfering interests. It became necessary therefore to enter into a con-

[19] Lord Clare, quoted by Plowden, vol. i. p. 611, note.

sideration of the manner, in which it should be arranged; and this discussion brought forward the imperial question of legislating for the regulation of commerce.

Towards the conclusion of the session of the year 1784, the clamours of the Irish manufacturers for protecting duties gave occasion to an address of the house of commons, in which that assembly expressed its hope, that before the commencement of the ensuing session a plan might be arranged, for the adjustment of the reciprocal commerce of the two kingdoms. The ensuing session was accordingly opened with a speech, in which such an adjustment was recommended to the attention of the parliament, and a plan for effecting it was shortly afterwards proposed by the secretary. The arrangement, as it was thus originally proposed, was speedily approved with scarcely any disagreement. But, when it was afterwards submitted to the parliament of Great Britain, the minister was compelled to introduce into it a number of modifications, by which the nature of the adjustment was essentially affected. The merchants and manufacturers were importunate for commercial restrictions; the leader of the opposition[1], Mr. Fox, contended for the necessity of reserving to Great Britain the entire guardianship and direction of the commercial interests of the empire; and the influence of the East India Company, which had recently overthrown the power of that statesman, was on this occasion united with his in opposing the pretensions of Ireland, as interfering with its monopoly. In these circumstances the original ten propositions, which in the Irish parliament had been increased to eleven, were further augmented to twenty; and a code of commercial regulation was formed, which imposed various restrictions on the foreign trade of Ireland, and conditioned for the surrender of much of its legislative independence. The measure, thus altered, encountered in Ireland an opposition, which could not be overcome. The public feeling was arrayed against a system so injurious to the recent acquisitions of the country, and the powers of the two great orators of the time were emulously exerted in exposing the iniquity of its provisions. The measure, though still supported by a small

[1] Plowden, vol. ii. p. 118.

majority of the commons, was abandoned by the government as impracticable.

To reconcile the commercial interests of two countries, circumstanced as Great Britain and Ireland were at that period, was indeed no easy task. Great Britain, though loaded with public incumbrances, maintained her extensive trade by the great accumulations of private capital, while Ireland, exempt from any grievous oppression of public burdens, but also destitute of the powerful resource of private capital, was forced to stimulate by numerous bounties an unpractised and unenterprising commerce. Between two nations so diversely situated, to frame an adjustment essentially equitable might confound the ingenuity of man. The difficulty was enhanced by the independence of the American states, which had converted a colonial into a foreign trade of great and growing importance. The question of the channel-trade involved the consideration of colonial produce, and the similarity of their productions connected the traffic of the independent states with that of the remaining colonies. This was at the same time the commerce, to which Ireland might look with the greatest confidence of hope. The position of the country was eminently favourable to the intercourse; the frequent migration of the people had established a multiplied relation of personal connexion; and the two nations, having begun together the career of independence, seemed destined by Providence itself to maintain a sympathy of public feeling.

The necessary difficulties of the arrangement appear to have been increased by the vain desire of the British parliament, to resume in the tranquillity of peace a portion of the concessions, which had been extorted amidst the difficulties of war. That parliament had indeed[2], in the very moment of its acquiescence in the claims of Ireland, resolved that it was expedient to ascertain by some express provisions the nature of the connexion of the two countries. The Irish parliament however, satisfied with the acknowledgment of independence, took no notice of the declaration, and the two governments remained connected only by the common sovereignty of the crown. The hope of introducing a modification of the legislative independence

[2] Plowden, vol. ii. pp. 601, 605.

of Ireland seems to have been from that time abandoned, until the arrangement of a commercial treaty had come into discussion. Then it seems to have been thought, that the favourable moment had arrived. While Ireland was required to concede her unshackled industry to the jealousy of the British manufacturers, and a large portion of foreign commerce to the colonial monopoly of Great Britain and to the East India Company, she was also required to surrender to the imperial regulation of the sister-country everything, which might distinguish her own parliament from a mere council of municipal administration. The failure of the measure, which indeed might have been foreseen, served to[3] illustrate the embarrassments of the relative situation of the two countries.

This specimen of these difficulties was exhibited in the proceedings of the British, the next in that of the Irish parliament; and, as the dissension had in the one case arisen on a question of commerce, so did it arise in the other on a question of constitution.

This other difficulty was occasioned by the first of those grievous visitations, with which the reigning sovereign was afflicted. While the British minister procured the concurrence of the parliament of Great Britain in the adoption of a plan, for restricting the authority to be exercised by the regent during the incapacity of the king, the prevailing sentiment of the Irish parliament was favourable to the measure advocated by the British opposition, which would have vested in the heir apparent a sovereignty entire and unrestrained. It was natural that the Irish opposition should, on this interesting occasion, associate itself with the party, from which, when in the possession of power, the country had received its independence. Individuals also regarded the crisis as a favourable opportunity for gratifying and strengthening a party, from the aggrandisement of which they might expect to derive advantages to themselves. It seems too to have been very generally felt, that Ireland had then an imperial question to negotiate, and that it was incumbent on every man to make the best use of the

[3] The measure of a legislative union was accordingly suggested by the marquess of Lansdown in a debate on this measure in the British house of lords.

occasion. So heterogeneous were the members of this new combination, that it was judged necessary to record their union by a written engagement. So avowed was the speculation of personal advantage, that one individual became notorious, for justifying his defection from the party of the government, by pleading that it was but a guess, and he had guessed wrong.

The lord lieutenant had postponed, as long as was possible, the meeting of the Irish parliament, while he vainly endeavoured to retain in their ranks the customary majority of the government. It at length became necessary for him to expose himself to the trial, which proved unfavourable, the opposition having acquired a decisive superiority. The two houses accordingly determined to address the prince of Wales, requesting him to assume the entire exercise of the royal functions. The chief governor having refused to transmit their address, alleging that such an act would exceed the powers, with which he was intrusted, the house of commons voted a censure of his conduct, and a deputation, composed of the most respected lords and commoners was then sent, to communicate to the prince the concurrent wishes of the two houses. The delays of the Irish government however, though they had failed to hinder this expression of the sentiment of the parliament, effectually frustrated its operation, for the deputies of the parliament arrived so late, that the prince could only thank them for the zeal, which they had manifested in his cause.

The failure of the commercial treaty had exhibited the impracticability of adjusting the commercial pretensions of the two countries, and the disagreement in regard to the regency had demonstrated the possibility of a dissension on some question directly affecting their connexion. Within seven years from the establishment of the independence of Ireland the one transaction had displayed a commercial, the other a political rivalry; and both together manifested almost all the alienation, which could exist between two countries governed by a common sovereign[4]. What should be the final result of this alienation, depended on the constitution of the Irish parliament, and on the composition of the

[4] Religious alienation did not at this time operate

Irish people. If the Irish parliament were closely connected in interest with the people, and that people were bound together in an unanimity of public feeling, it might be concluded, that the spirit of national independence would impel the legislature into some direct and fatal collision with the parliament of Great Britain. If on the other hand the parliament were but very imperfectly connected with the people, and the people divided between two contending interests, the result would not less naturally be, that in some crisis of public difficulty the Irish legislature should yield, in its own essential weakness, to the ascendency of the legislature of the better constituted and more powerful government, relinquishing in an incorporate union its separate existence.

The parliament of Ireland[5] has been traced back to the year 1295, and was consequently in its origin but forty-one years later than the first convocation of representatives of counties in England, and but twelve years later than the first introduction of representatives of boroughs in that country. Seventy-two years however elapsed from this commencement to the parliament of Kilkenny, the first convention, which appears to have properly merited the name. Feeble and irregular must have been, even after this time, the authority of the Irish parliament, since one hundred and twenty-eight years afterwards it enacted for its own protection that very law of Poynings, which afterwards became an object of universal execration, as not consistent with the independence of a national legislature. Nor was it more proportioned to the extent of the country, than to the protection of the immediate subjects of the king, the river Barrow[6], thirty miles westward from Dublin, being at that time proverbially the boundary of its jurisdiction. The number of its members was accordingly much less considerable than in later times. At the close of the reign of Henry VIII. there were only thirteen counties and thirty-four boroughs[7], which sent representatives to the parliament, so that the house of commons could then consist of only nine-four members. The commons assembled by Elizabeth in the year 1560 amounted only to seventy-six[8].

[5] Hist. of the Political Connexion between Great Britain and Ireland, p. 37. London. 1780. [6] Ibid., p. 97. [7] Ibid., p. 108.
[8] Ibid., p. 109.

That queen however having at length effected the reduction of the entire island, the whole was by her successor distributed into counties sending representatives; and, when parliaments had been interrupted during twenty-seven years[9], the first general parliament of Ireland was convened in the year 1614. James I. on this occasion, while he added to the house of commons the representatives of seventeen new counties, augmented the number of boroughs by forty new incorporations, a measure adopted expressly for securing a majority against the recusants[10], and which, in an assembly of two hundred and thirty-two members, did actually procure for the government an excess of only twenty-four. This was the epoch of the borough-system of Ireland, and the recusant lords of the pale protested against the measures of erecting petty villages into corporations[11], in the very same manner in which the patriots of a later time inveighed against the inequality of representation, as an indefensible corruption of the original constitution of the government. When Roman Catholics were at length excluded from the Irish parliament, the borough-system, no longer required as a defence against recusants, became a support of the government, or rather of the Irish oligarchy, against the popular interest.

As the acquisition of a free trade had suggested the expediency of ensuring its permanence by the independence of the legislature, so the emancipation of the legislature from external control as naturally directed the wishes of the public to the further attempt of purifying it from internal influence. That the latter effort should be exerted at this particular time, was perhaps the result of an emulation of a similar proceeding in England. This was accordingly the object of the military convention assembled in Dublin in the year 1783, a formidable congress representing a self-enrolled and unpaid army, and calling on the government of the country to submit itself to public opinion, and to rectify its constitution as should be required. Mr. Flood, agreeably to the desire of the convention, introduced the measure into the house of commons, though without avowing himself the delegate of a military assembly. The proposal was firmly

[9] Hist. of the Political Connexion &c., p. 134. [10] Leland, vol. ii. p. 447. [11] Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 442—444.

resisted, as a dangerous example of the dictation of an armed body; and this earliest effort for the attainment of a parliamentary reform in Ireland, ended in giving a shock to the volunteer system, by which it had been originated. The effort was renewed in the following year by the same gentleman, simply as a member of the legislature; but, though the measure was not then exposed to the same powerful objection, it was still resisted by a majority so considerable, that it was for a time abandoned.

In the interval between the establishment of Irish independence and the agitation of the question of the regency, the parliamentary parties of Ireland had not received any distinct formation. The great struggle of the regency gave a beginning to the division, an intimate connexion being at that time formed between those portions of the British and Irish parliaments, which agreed in proposing to invest the heir apparent of the crown with the entire power of the sovereign. Most indeed of those members of the Irish parliament, who then went over from the government to the opposition, returned to their former connexion, as soon as the recovery of the king had convinced them of the imprudence of the speculation; but the family of Ponsonby, with that characteristic spirit, which in the government of lord Townshend had spurned the chair of the house of commons, refused to support a lord lieutenant on whom they had voted a censure, and remained some time in opposition.

The government, after this struggle, was not inattentive to the means of resisting the opposition, to which it had given being. Though the professed principle of the marquess of Buckingham, then lord lieutenant, had been the maintenance of a vigilant and severe economy, the sources of influence were opened with profusion. Places were revived or multiplied, the salaries of existing offices were augmented, and the register of venality was lengthened with additional pensions.

The arrangement of parties, which was at this time formed, seems to have been the completion of the operation which had been begun twenty years before by lord Townshend. Lord Clare, in his speech concerning the union, observed, that that viceroy had but imperfectly succeeded in suppressing the oligarchy of the country. The great interest

of the Ponsonbies, which he had laboured to subdue, renewed, after no long interval, its connexion with the government; and it was only in the agitation of the question of the regency, that this interest was finally transferred to the opposition, of which it constituted the principal strength, and furnished one of the most distinguished leaders.

In the front of this opposition stood Mr. Grattan, the champion of Irish independence, who exercised all his acute and sententious eloquence in exposing and vilifying the system, according to which the government was then administered. In this warfare of parliament he was supported and assisted by men of talents the most dissimilar, and of interests the most distinct. On the one side of him stood Mr. Ponsonby, the representative of the former oligarchy, denouncing the government with an energy of language, which none had anticipated, and with a commanding firmness, which set at defiance the power of his adversaries. On the other was Mr. Curran, the representative of a lower order of the people, displaying very little indeed of political wisdom, but exhausting the stores of a rich and cultivated fancy in the most lavish vituperation.

The measures of the opposition appear to have been combined and conducted with the most perfect regularity. United in a whig club, they appear to have distributed to the performers the parts of the political drama, and to have sent them forward in a predetermined order, to engage in succession the attention of the public. The club was specifically pledged for three popular measures. These were a bill for reducing and limiting the pension-list, and for excluding from the parliament persons holding any other pensions, than those granted for life; a bill for securing the responsibility of the public officers in regard to the payments issued from the treasury, which might, as the law then stood, be directed by the sole authority of the king; and a bill for excluding from the parliament certain descriptions of place-men, and obliging the rest to subject their acceptance of offices to the judgment of their constituents, by vacating their seats.

The people did not fail to remark, that the boasted measures of the whig club did not include a reform of the parliament, which for some time had been with themselves a

favourite object. They accordingly regarded the whole scheme of the opposition as a futile attempt to combine the popular sentiment with aristocratic influence, looking on with open indifference, and with secret ridicule, while its leaders were exerting every effort to conciliate their confidence. A reform of the parliament was indeed at length, in the year 1793, proposed by the club, but the season of popularity had then passed. The measure had been forced on the party by an apprehension of an extreme proceeding of the same kind, and was, in the very terms employed by Mr. Grattan, an attempt to oppose a reformed representation of property to a representation of the multitude, which in his own peculiar phraseology he characterised as a *felonious* representation. The question of the Roman Catholics was in like manner proscribed by the whig club, as not suited to an assemblage so heterogeneous in political principles; but the club afterwards with the same late-repentant policy, voted its thanks to Mr. Grattan for the vehement manifesto [12], with which, in the year 1795, he answered the address of the Roman Catholics of Dublin, on the recall of earl Fitzwilliam from the government of Ireland.

The immediate issue of this struggle of parties was the extinction of the opposition, the efforts of the court being successfully exerted against a party, which the popular sentiment did not acknowledge and support. That party accordingly dwindled in number and consideration, until it became the mere shadow of the opposition, which had once menaced the government; and at length, in the year 1797, when the country had arrived at the verge of rebellion, it seceded from the parliament, and Mr. Grattan declined to be returned for the ensuing year. Its remoter consequence was that it discredited the government. A constitution, which was unavoidably a distorted copy of that of England, was, while opposition maintained its ground, exposed to the public scorn by all the powers of genius; and then, by the final secession of that party, a solemn appeal was made from the government to an alienated people.

The relaxation of the popery-laws had altered very essen-

[12] 'I find,' said he in this answer, 'the country already committed in the struggle; I beg to be committed along with her, and to abide the issues of her fortunes.'—Plowden, vol. ii. p. 510, note.

tially the relative situation of the people and the parliament. Before the commencement of the reign of George III., the Roman Catholics of Ireland could scarcely be considered as forming a part of its people; before the year 1793, when the elective franchise was conceded to them, they did not form a part of its citizens; from this time the question between them and the Protestants was whether they should form a part of its government. Of the change thus wrought in regard to that portion of the population it is here important to remark, that it re-animated a principle of division and mutual alienation, which had been overborne, and almost stifled, by the heavy pressure of the penal code.

A distinct cause of excitement, though connected with this in its operation, was the extraordinary increase of the number of the people. It appears[13], that the population of Ireland, which in the year 1695 had been estimated at little more than a million, had in the year 1777 been rated at considerably more than two millions and a half, and in the year 1791 was found to exceed four millions two hundred thousand. In the year 1805 it was estimated at nearly five millions and a half; and it has since been found by actual numeration to have exceeded seven millions seven hundred thousand.

The proximate causes of this rapid increase appear to have been more particularly the general use of a species of food[14], which multiplies at the least in a fourfold proportion the means of subsistence, and the habit of dispensing with every accommodation, which may not almost anywhere be found. The spring of population, thus assisted in a salubrious climate, and in long continued tranquillity, would naturally expand itself with considerable force. The ori-

[13] Newenham's Inquiry into the Population of Ireland, pp. 94, 223. Lond., 1805.

[14] The potato appears to have been originally wild in the mountains of Chili, and to have followed the direction of the Cordileras northward even beyond the equator, but to have been stopped in its migration by the small elevation of the hills in the isthmus of Darien. From southern to northern America it may have been conveyed by English navigators, who continued to sail in the track of Columbus, that they might profit by the trade-winds. It was introduced from Virginia into Ireland in the year 1586, but it was then common both in Spain and Italy.—De Humboldt's Polit. Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain, vol. ii. pp. 487, 495.

ginal adoption of the potato, as the prevailing food of the lower classes of the Irish, was most probably the result of indigence, compelling them to abandon their accustomed diet; and the same indigence also probably gave being, in part at least, to the habitual disregard of all the ordinary accommodations of life. The Irish peasantry accordingly was multiplied even by the influence of distress, with a rapidity bearing some correspondence to the growth of an American settlement.

During much of the last century two distinct drains served to carry away the redundancy of this extraordinary increase. The peasantry of the south and west of Ireland were enlisted for the French and Spanish service, while those of the north contributed largely to people the West Indies and the settlements of North America. The former of these drains is stated to have been closed soon after the year 1748[15], in which was concluded the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. The inconvenience of redundant population was accordingly, after a few years, exhibited in domestic disturbances, the insurgents, named *white-boys*, having commenced their outrages in the year 1762[16]. The immediate occasion of the disturbance was the oppressive augmentation of rents[17], a peasantry multiplied far beyond the demand for labour, bidding, as at an auction, for the spots of ground, on which they might exist. It was indeed found convenient to direct its violence against the claims of the clergy, but its true principle was a resistance to the extortion of the landlords. From that insurrection to the rebellion of the year 1798, a scarcely-interrupted succession of local outrages has, under various denominations, disgraced the history of Ireland, assuming at length, in the progress of the dissension of the country, a political character; and from the two contending parties of *peep-of-day-boys*[18] and *defenders*[19]

[15] Inquiry into the Population of Ireland, p. 74. [16] Collectanea Politica, vol. i. p. 30. [17] Ibid., p. 32. Inquiry, &c. p. 49.

[18] Pieces of Irish History by W. J. Mac Neven, pp. 140, &c. 212. New York, 1807. [19] The *peep-of-day-boys*, being Protestants, endeavoured to take away arms from Roman Catholics, who were then beginning to provide them; these, in resisting them, assumed the name of *defenders*. The former assumed the name of *Orange-men*, when they engaged in open hostility; but, as all these men afterwards became *united Irishmen*, they had no connexion with those, who subse-

the last in the series of local insurgents, the absorbing association of United Irishmen, merging their mutual hostility in the common cause of rebellion, received a considerable support.

While the Roman Catholics, both by the relaxation of the popery-laws, and by the numerical increase of the lower orders of the people, were acquiring importance in the state, the Presbyterians of Belfast stood forward to claim for them all the rights of citizens, the influence of commercial opulence having added strength to the natural tendency of a republican church. The deputies of the volunteers of Belfast[20], sent to the national convention assembled in Dublin in the year 1783, were accordingly instructed to support the abolition of all their disqualifications. The instruction was disregarded by the convention, which looked only to a reform of parliament; but the same spirit continued to be cherished in that town, and after eight years gave being to the association of United Irishmen.

The revolution of France, the anniversary of which was solemnized at Belfast in the year 1791, animated the exertions of those, who were desirous of effecting considerable changes in favour of popular pretensions[21]. In the latter part of the same year, in which it was thus celebrated, the first club of United Irishmen accordingly was formed in Belfast; a second was soon afterwards constituted in Dublin, and many others were speedily associated throughout the northern province of Ireland. In these clubs the Roman Catholics added their numerical force to that of the Pres-

quently assumed that appellation, as adversaries to the political pretensions of Roman Catholics. It is a curious fact that the origin of the feud between those earlier Orange-men and the Roman Catholics was merely casual. The people of two neighbouring districts in the county of Armagh, where the feud was begun, Protestants and Roman Catholics promiscuously, were arrayed in two hostile parties, in consequence of a dispute about the comparative merits of two horses in a race. When these disorderly associations had been thus formed, they proceeded to drive away servants, who had come from Connaught, not on account of their religion, but because they lowered the wages of labour. After some time a part of one of these associations committed a robbery, the robbers being Roman Catholics. The Protestants on this account expelled all Roman Catholics from the associations, and the feud was begun.

[20] Mem. of Theobald Wolfe Tone, vol. i. p. 57. Lond. 1827.

[21] Pieces of Irish History, pp. 16—18.

byterians, for effecting a reform in the representation: and the Presbyterians supported the Roman Catholics in their claim of a removal of all political disabilities.

In the history of the United Irishmen a distinction is stated to have existed between the original associations of the year 1791 and those[22], which began to be organized in the autumn of the year 1794, and were completed in the year 1796. A distinction did certainly exist between them, inasmuch as the former were public, and proposed a reform of the house of commons, the latter were secret, and had for their object a revolution. But this distinction was of little practical importance. The reform proposed by the earlier United Irishmen, being founded on universal suffrage, was a revolution in disguise, as it would have arrayed the population against the property of the country. It is in this view deserving of attention, that Mr. Emmet, who was probably the most moderate of the chiefs of the conspiracy, has actually mentioned[23], among the advantages of a reform of parliament, such as he contemplated, a compulsory diminution of the rents of lands.

Doctor Mac Neven indeed has declared[24] that some of the most confidential men in the north would have been satisfied with the species of reform, which was proposed by Mr. George Ponsonby; and that he was certain, that the country at large would have been contented with that[25], which Mr. W. B. Ponsonby afterwards submitted to the house of commons. Mr. Emmet has also declared that[26], after the failure of the invasion attempted at Bantry by the

[22] Pieces of Irish History, pp. 90, 91, 209. [23] Ibid., pp. 264, 271, 273. [24] Ibid. p. 246. [25] According to this, the last proposal for changing the constitution of the Irish house of commons, every county was to be divided into districts, containing each six thousand houses, and each returning two members, in whose election should vote, besides all persons possessing freeholds of the annual value of forty shillings, all others possessing leasehold interests of an annual value to be regulated, all possessing houses of a value to be also determined, all who should during a certain number of years have practised a trade in any great city or town, and all who should enjoy the freedom of any city or town by birth, marriage, or servitude. The house thus constituted, was to subsist a determinate number of years. —Plowden, vol. ii. p. 621. [26] Pieces of Irish History, pp. 224, 256.

French, it was his intention to recommend, if there had been any reasonable hope of the adoption of reform, that another messenger should be sent to France, to renounce the connexion formed with that country. But, besides that even the original United Irishmen explicitly proposed the establishment of universal suffrage, the bill introduced by Mr. George Ponsonby in the year 1793 was in effect lost through the immovable indifference of the people[27], and it appears certain that the great body of the United Irishmen would have acquiesced even in the latter, only as it might appear to help them onward in the career of revolution. Mr. Emmet himself described the later United Irishmen as an association of immovable republicans, composed of men of the middling and lower classes of society, and only engulphing into it, in its progress, those persons of the upper ranks, who afterwards appeared as leaders. Neither was Mr. Emmet himself[28], nor doctor Mac Neven, connected with the association, until it had attained its maturity. Though therefore the ability of these two men did then place them at its head, it may reasonably be doubted, whether even their sentiments can be considered as having been capable of influencing in favour of any modification of the constitution the multitude, over which they presided.

In the year 1793 the urgent solicitation of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, presented in a petition to the king, obtained for them the elective franchise, together with some other advantages, in consideration of which they were then contented to forego the object of their other prayer for parliamentary reform. The concession however appears not to have had any, even temporary operation, in restraining the progress of the United Irishmen towards a revolution[29], for early in the following year they published a plan of a strictly equal representation of the people on the principle of universal suffrage, and before its conclusion their association became secret and revolutionary. These considerations may prove how vain was the expectation of earl Fitzwilliam, who

[27] Plowden, vol. ii. p. 431. 'A mistress,' said Mr. Flood, 'which the people of Ireland sought for with a lover's appetite, was, when brought to their embraces, repudiated with a lover's inconstancy.'

[28] Pieces of Irish History, p. 215. - Collectanea Politica, vol. iii. p. 111.

in the beginning of the year 1795 took possession of the government, that the agitation of the country might be calmed by merely satisfying the Roman Catholics. His brief government on the other hand exercised an important influence in accelerating the crisis of the public interests, his imprudent encouragement exciting the most confident hope, which was suddenly repressed by his speedy and abrupt recall.

The rebellion of the year 1798 however had its origin among the Presbyterians, not among the Roman Catholics, the latter being naturally more anxious for the removal of their own disabilities, than for changes in the form of a government, in which they did not yet fully participate. It accordingly appeared at the close of the year 1796, when a French armament arrived in the bay of Bantry, that there was no military organisation of the Roman Catholics in the south of Ireland. But when the winds of heaven had dissipated that force[30], effectual means were employed for enlisting the Roman Catholics in the cause of revolution; and so ardently did the bigotry of popery then engage in the struggle, that it shocked and disgusted the very men, who had been taught to unite with them for the attainment of the common freedom, and, by sending these back into the ranks of loyalty, effected eventually the deliverance of the country.

Before the struggle of arms had been begun, the political struggle of the parliament had reached its crisis in the secession of the opposition. When the plan of parliamentary reform, proposed by Mr. W. B. Ponsonby, was discountenanced by the house of commons, Mr. Grattan declared that, from that day, his party should cease to attend their meetings. From that day, the fifteenth of May in the year 1797, it was his opinion that the Irish parliament was committed with the people; nor did he again appear in the house of commons, until the agitation of the union brought him forward, to make an effort for preserving that, which three

[30] On this occasion a long continuance of easterly winds defeated the hostile armament. In the following year a westerly wind, which blew almost without intermission during six weeks, detained another so long in the Texel, that the expedition was frustrated.—Mem. of Theob. W. Tone, vol. ii. pp. 247, 248.

years before he had abandoned as incorrigible and hopeless. Great indeed were the benefits, which Ireland had received from its parliament; and most natural was it, that its services should be remembered with affection in the hour of its distress, and that the champion of its independence should feel, that his own frame was embodied in its existence. That parliament however does not appear to have been fitted for a longer existence. Its situation was peculiar, and its duties were embarrassing. One duty required, that it should maintain a close connexion with the British government; another demanded, that it should preserve the confidence and attachment of the people of Ireland. It adhered to the connexion, but it lost the people. Its friends indeed have alleged in its defence, that in the last period of its existence it evinced the utility of a resident legislature by the promptness and vigour, with which it encountered insurrection. It is however an inappropriate defence of a legislative body, that, when it had ceased to be efficient as a legislature, it was still able to make war.

The union itself may be regarded as a proof, that the parliament of Ireland had reached the natural limit of its duration. If such a measure were honestly adopted, the parliament must have become conscious of its own insufficiency; if it were purchased by corruption, the parliament must have been unworthy to exist. The latter was the case, which actually occurred, all the sources of patronage being opened wide for the purpose. Promotion in every line was either granted, or promised in reversion; and a sum of sixteen thousand pounds was applied to satisfy every person, who could show that he had been able to determine the choice of the representatives of any borough, which the measure should deprive of its representation. Such was indeed the repugnance of the parliament, that the measure was at the first proposal rejected, neither perhaps could it have been finally effected, if the place-law, obtained some time before by the efforts of the whig-party, had not supplied a convenient method of altering the composition of the house of commons. The government could not in this case venture to appeal to the people by a dissolution of the parliament; but so many of the adversaries of the measure were contented to compromise their opposition by withdraw-

ing under the operation of that act, that the minority supporting the government was transformed into a considerable majority.

In obtaining the acquiescence of the numerical majority of the people the government was assisted by the heterogeneous nature of the opposition in the house of commons, one portion of that party being disposed to yield to all the pretensions of the Roman Catholics, the other being steadily determined to withhold every further concession. When earl Fitzwilliam was recalled from the government, the Roman Catholics were so hostile to the plan of a union[31], which then began to be apprehended[32], that at a public meeting, held in Dublin, they declared, that they would resist even their own 'emancipation,' if offered upon such a condition. In this state of their minds Mr. George Ponsonby, the leader of that part of the opposition which favoured the Roman Catholics, offered to the leader of the other, to engage for their support in opposing the union, if he would engage that his party should concur in admitting their pretensions. This offer was declined; and it seems to have been then, when they had failed in treating with the opposition for their active support, that they treated with the lord lieutenant, the marquess Cornwallis, for their acquiescence in a plan, which they would willingly have resisted. To the arrangement at that time formed between the viceroy and the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the king was a stranger; but Mr. Pitt felt himself bound to retire from the administration, when he found that the scruples of his sovereign could not be removed.

The history of Ireland, which has been reviewed to the union, that the survey might be complete, presents a series of events most curiously combined. Its earlier period, un-

[31] Collectanea Politica, vol. iii. p. 135. [32] From two passages in a printed letter, addressed by lord Fitzwilliam to lord Carlisle, after he had been recalled, it appears that the postponement of further advantages, to be granted to the Roman Catholics, had just then begun to be considered by the minister, as conducive to the attainment of an incorporating union.—Ibid., vol. iii. pp. 134, 135. The minister has on this account been accused of planning to drive the Roman Catholics to a rebellion for the accomplishment of his policy. That he had no such atrocious purpose appears from the latter passage, in which it was proposed to defer the question to the re-establishment of peace.

happy as it was, prepared that party of Roman Catholics, which, in the struggles terminated by the English revolution, was opposed, as an antagonist force, to the Scotish Presbyterians, and thus assisted in effecting the adjustment of the government of England. When this important function had been discharged, Ireland had then to prepare itself for entering with sufficient advantage into the general incorporation of an united empire, the preceding period of its history, however conducive to the general improvement and benefit in assisting to adjust the balance of the English constitution, having been inauspicious to the domestic interests of the country. Of that preparation it was a necessary condition, that one of the two parties, by which it was distracted, should suffer a temporary depression so entire, that the other should not be embarrassed and obstructed in its efforts to attain national independence. The prosperity thus acquired extended however its influence even to the party, by the depression of which it had been attained; the Roman Catholics accordingly, participating in the advantages achieved by the Protestants, rose again to a political importance, in which they were opposed to the ascendency of the prevailing party; and a short struggle of rebellion, the natural result of an ungoverned desire of independence among a portion of the Protestants, aided by the ancient disaffection of the adverse party, brought the country into a situation, in which the minister was able to consolidate the empire by the union[33] of Ireland.

In concluding the separate history of Ireland we have to notice the various merit of Goldsmith, which, both in prose and in poetry, has illustrated its brief period of tranquillity. Of this eminent and interesting writer it has been well observed[34] by his biographer that, as a model of the middle or

[33] In this union, from a combined consideration of comparative population and revenue, a hundred members of the house of commons were allowed to Ireland, and twenty-eight temporal, with four spiritual lords. For reducing the number of the representative members, the capital and Cork alone of the cities and boroughs were permitted to return two, and eighty-four boroughs were wholly disfranchised, the sum of sixteen thousand pounds being paid in compensation for each. The imperial house of commons is accordingly composed of six hundred and fifty-eight members, five hundred and thirteen being returned by England, and forty-five by Scotland.

[34] Prior's Life of Goldsmith, vol. ii. pp. 555, 557.

elegant style in prose literature, he ranks between two of his countrymen, Swift a model of the plain style and Burke of the higher order of eloquence, and may at least divide the palm with Addison, if not claim it wholly to himself. Of his poetry the same writer has, with apparent justice, pronounced, that his various qualities have entitled him to be placed, among those of the preceding age, next to Dryden and Pope.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the history of Great Britain, from the end of the American war in the year 1783 *to the beginning of the war with France in the year* 1793.

Mr. Pitt minister in the year 1783—Government of India regulated, 1784—Sinking-fund regulated and secured, 1786—Great prosperity of the empire, 1792—War with France, 1793—Chemistry improved by Black, Cavendish, Priestley, and Lavoisier; the Galvanic chemistry discovered; the science greatly extended by Davy—Astronomy improved and extended by Bradley and Herschell—The steam-engine invented by Watt.

THE negotiations which terminated the war of the American colonies, were begun and concluded in the administration of the earl of Shelburne, who had succeeded the marquess of Rockingham. When the death of the latter of these noblemen had dissolved the union of his ill-combined ministry, one portion of it remained in office under the direction of the former, while the other, led by Mr. Fox, went over to the opposition. This schism of the Whigs was the parent of the coalition, which gave the first wound to the credit of Mr. Fox. More deeply affected by the recent irritation of his quarrel with his late associate, than by his old animosity against his vanquished antagonist, he chose rather to seek an augmentation of his strength in a junction with the man, against whom he had forcibly and frequently denounced the vengeance of an injured people, than listen to the conciliating overtures of him, who, from being his colleague, had become his successful rival. The measure had at the time all the

success, which could have been expected. The ministry of lord Shelburne was forced to yield to the power of the united parties[1], and the nation with surprise beheld for a few months in the offices of the two secretaries of state the two individuals, who had during the whole of the American war maintained a political contest of not less violence.

In vain Mr. Fox represented[2], that the question, in regard to which he had differed from lord North, was then at rest. In vain did his friend lord John Cavendish endeavour to shelter their coalition under the example of that union of interests, which in the German war had exalted to so proud an elevation the glory of the British government. It was felt by the public, that the contest of the two parliamentary leaders had been for a principle, and not merely for a measure, and that, though the war had ceased, the difference of principle could not be forgotten without an inconsistency, which should destroy all confidence in the sincerity and steadiness of statesmen. Though a union of interests had, in a difficult crisis, given being to a ministry, which was ennobled by the successes of the nation, yet only the partiality of friendship could discover any correspondence in this coalition. No marked opposition of principle had separated the parties of that celebrated ministry[3], nor were they brought together by any mutual trafficking for support. The arrangement of the administration was dictated by the superiority of one master-mind, and the nation contemplated only the individual, whom it had forced into power, as the single person capable of effecting the salvation of the state.

The prime mover in all these proceedings appears to have been Mr. Burke, who in the earlier administration of the marquess of Rockingham had been selected to be his secretary[4], as the marquess was unacquainted with official busi-

[1] His resignation is however by Mr. Nicholls attributed to an affront, which the king, as he conceived, had put upon him, in causing the party in parliament, distinguished by the name of the household troops, to vote against the peace.—Recollections, &c., p. 51. [2] Annals of the Reign of George III., vol. ii. p. 160. [3] Anecdotes of the Earl of Chatham, vol. i. pp. 172, 173. [4] Mr. Burke had gone to Ireland as private secretary to Mr. Hamilton (generally known by the name of *single-speech* Hamilton) who was secretary to the lord lieutenant. He was at this time engaged in conducting the Annual Register for Dodsley the bookseller.—Nicholls, p. 20.

ness, and who had since acquired a guiding influence in his party. To the personal animosity, entertained by Mr. Burke against the earl of Shelburne, has been attributed the disruption of the whig-party consequent to the death of the marquess[5]; and to the speculation of the same individual has also been ascribed the famous India-bill, introduced by Mr. Fox into parliament[6], which overthrew his ministry, and elevated Mr. Pitt. The ascendency, which the extraordinary genius and information of Mr. Burke had gained for him over the mind of the marquess of Rockingham, was continued over that of the duke of Portland, who succeeded as the head of the party, and he was accordingly the chief adviser, while Mr. Fox was the most efficient debater of the Whigs.

The affairs of the eastern settlements had two years before attracted the attention of the parliament[7], and two committees had been appointed for considering the numerous and vehement complaints of male-administration, which resounded from every quarter. It was admitted by all per-

[5] Nicholls, pp. 45, 49, 50. This may perhaps be sufficiently explained by the preference, which the king had manifested for the earl over the marquess, with whom all the hopes of Mr. Burke were connected. The king had sent lord Thurlow to the marquess about the formation of a new ministry; but, when the marquess required to be admitted to an audience before any arrangement should be made, the king sent for the earl, arranged the administration with him, and then sent him to the marquess.—Ibid., pp. 43, 44. [6] Ibid., p. 55. Mr. Nicholls has connected this measure with an unsuccessful speculation in India-stock, in which Mr. Burke had been concerned.—Ibid., pp. 54, 55. It seems however to have been a speculation sufficiently obvious to a man confident in his own talents, whose hopes of advancement were all connected with the success of a party discountenanced by the court. Lord North indeed saw that it was too daring, and remarked that he thought it a good receipt to knock up an administration. —Ibid., p. 56. [7] The first considerable acquisition of territory occurred in the year 1765, and in the years immediately succeeding several acts of parliament passed, the object of which however was only the regulation of dividends, and other financial concerns of the company. In the year 1773 the abuses of the government caused a law to be enacted for correcting them, but it proved very inadequate to its purpose. In the year 1781 it was judged necessary to appoint two committees for the consideration of the affairs of India, and these continued to sit until the close of the session of the year 1783. Mr. Fox proposed his plan in the following November.—Bishop Tomline's Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. i. pp. 135—139. London, 1821.

sons, that some important change of the Indian government had become indispensably necessary. The factories of a commercial country had within a few years been extended into a great empire. Territorial control had accordingly become vested in a society of merchants, and territorial revenue had become combined with the interests of their commerce. Abuses enormous and multiplied had grown out of a system thus heterogeneous and disproportioned. It had therefore become urgently necessary to introduce into it such modifications, as might accommodate the management to the altered circumstances of the company, and prevent by a more efficient superintendence the perpetual recurrence of misgovernment.

The necessary materials for this important deliberation had been already collected by two committees, constituted for the consideration of the affairs of India; the public mind had become impatient of the complaints, which had been during more than two years submitted to their investigation; and after the loss of thirteen western colonies, it was natural that the nation should look with increased solicitude to its eastern possessions. In an evil hour for the ministry it was determined, to endeavour to render the new arrangement instrumental to its permanence, by establishing a lasting interest in the parliament. It was accordingly proposed to subject the affairs of the company to a board of commissioners, nominated in the first instance by a parliament, and removable only in consequence of the address of either house. As the places of these commissioners should become vacant, they were to be filled by the nomination of the crown; but the original members being named in the bill, and not removable at pleasure, formed a phalanx of ministerial strength, devoted to the projector of the measure and independent of the executive authority.

It is not easy to conceive, that this measure could have been planned with any other design, than that of securing such a personal influence in the parliament, as might be too strong for the sovereign, since whatever reason might exist for vesting in the crown the right of making the subsequent appointments, must have been, on any general principle, not less applicable to the original board. Considered in reference to personal aggrandisement it is on the contrary con-

sistent and intelligible. The parliamentary strength, acquired by the original appointments, would control the succeeding nominations; and the crown might thus be safely gratified with the exterior form of royal nominations; while the nation should continue to be governed by the same party through the influence of India.

The powers to be granted to the board were suitable to the design of strengthening the party, which was then possessed of power. The abuses of the East India Company having arisen from the acquisition of an extensive territory, all which could be necessary for its reformation, was to subject its political concerns to the superintendence of the government, while its commercial interests should be reserved to the direction, under which they had hitherto prospered, and under which alone they could be managed with success. This moderation however was not compatible with the plan of converting the influence of India to the support of the minister. Mr. Fox accordingly proposed to vest in the commissioners, not merely the control of the political administration of the company, but, together with the direct management of its territorial possessions and revenues, the entire regulation also of its commerce.

The Whigs had long commanded the government by the strength of their parliamentary combinations. That strength had however been found to be insufficient since the accession of George III., and the India-bill seems to have been an effort to supply, by the influence of India, the deficiency of their own power, when they were no longer assisted by the influence of the crown. The effort failed, and the consequence was a further change in the character of the party. In their opposition to the minister, who had engaged the country in the war of America, they had been led to adopt principles of independence, exceeding the cautious moderation with which their predecessors had maintained the struggle of the English revolution. From this time they were forced to look more to the people for support, and their strength thenceforward consisted rather in the popularity of their principles[8], than in the influence which they could

[8] It has been remarked by bishop Tomline, that the language of one of these was very similar to that of the house of commons, which brought Charles I. to the scaffold, and overturned the constitution. This was

command in the house of commons by their aristocratic connexions.

By the proposed seizure of the rights of a great chartered society, the jealousy of the public was strongly excited, and other corporate bodies, alarmed by a precedent of so much danger, presented petitions against the bill, as a flagrant violation of the rights of property. The disapprobation of the king also was declared to lord Temple, who had availed himself of the privilege of his rank, to declare his sentiments to his sovereign. Though pressed thus at once by the king and by the people, the ministry continued for a short time to struggle with the difficulties of its situation, and violent resolutions were carried in the house of commons [9], denouncing the indignation of that assembly against

'that in the present situation of his majesty's dominions it is peculiarly necessary that there should be an administration which has the confidence of the house and of the public.' The requisition of the parliament in the time of Charles I. was 'that the power should be placed in the hands of those, in whom parliament, meaning the house of commons, could confide.' The bishop has inferred from letters written by the king to Mr. Pitt, and from other authorities, that the king had formed a serious intention of retiring to Hanover, if Mr. Fox and his party should prevail.—Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. i. p. 253. [9] In this quest of popularity Mr. Fox, who had attached himself to the party, supported on every occasion the measure of parliamentary reform, which was however as uniformly opposed by Mr. Burke, who knew that the strength of the party consisted in its borough-influence. The question was entailed on the parliament by the war of America, the public discontent having in the year 1779 given a beginning to associations, formed in different parts of the kingdom for effectuating the measure. By a general meeting of the friends of reform held at the house of the duke of Richmond, in London, in the year 1782, Mr. Pitt was deputed to propose it in the house of commons. Mr. Pitt was then not in office. A specific measure of this kind was two years afterwards proposed by him, when prime minister, but he subsequently abandoned it as dangerous. His proposal was that thirty-six decayed boroughs should be disfranchised, on their own application to parliament for that purpose, those persons who had a beneficial interest in such boroughs being compensated from a public fund. The representation of these boroughs was to be transferred to the counties and the metropolis. If any boroughs should remain so small and decayed, as to fall within a limit to be fixed by parliament in reference to the number of houses, their representation should in the like manner be transferred to such considerable towns, as might desire the privilege. The right of voting in counties was to be extended to copyholders. Mr. Grey, who first appeared in parliament in the year 1787, attached himself to the Whigs, and

those who should report the opinion of the king, or advise a dissolution. It was however forced to yield to a new ministry, at the head of which was Mr. Pitt.

The long administration of lord North had afforded a proof, that during a popular war, for the war of America was popular in Great Britain, the crown was enabled to support a minister against the opposition of the Whigs. That opposition did at last prevail against the minister, but not until the misfortunes of war had deprived it of popularity, and thereby destroyed the credit of administration. It was then to be seen, whether a minister could be supported against the Whigs without such assistance. For this it was necessary, that by some means the favour of the public should be attached to the individual, who should be the object of the preference of the sovereign. This occurred at the advancement of Mr. Pitt. The connexions of the Whigs were still able to maintain a resistance, which could be overcome only by dissolving the parliament; but the minister of the crown was also the minister of the people, and in the new parliament it was discovered, that his power was firmly established.

The crisis, in which the new minister assumed the direction of affairs, was arduous and embarrassing. A war had been recently concluded under the pressure of a severe necessity, and by that war had been severed from the empire thirteen colonies, which the illustrious parent of the minister had deemed necessary even to its existence, while the public burdens had been nearly doubled by the expenses incurred in the struggle[10]. It accordingly became the duty of the minister to provide for a greatly increased expenditure, when

in the year 1793, when the country had recently engaged in the war with France, brought the question again forward, declaring that he was ready to proceed even to universal suffrage, rather than to suffer the constistution to remain unaltered. The repeal of the corporation law and the test law was another measure of the Whigs, brought forward in the year 1790 by Mr. Fox, and opposed by Mr. Burke, who however admitted that ten years before he would have given at his support. This was carried in the year 1828.—Bishop Tomline's Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. i. pp. 51—54, 450—454. Gifford's Life of Mr. Pitt, vol. iii. pp. 135, 438—455; vol. i. p. 362; vol. ii. pp. 446, 464.

[10] The national debt at the commencement of the American war was 135,943,051*l*. The increase during the war was 121,269,992*l*.—Sinclair's Hist. of the Public Revenue, vol. i. p. 474.

the resources, by which it was to be supplied, appeared to have been considerably if not fatally reduced. It was indeed soon discovered, that the separation of the American states had by no means inflicted a wound, from which the empire was never to recover. As the benefit of the connexion had resulted from the commercial relations, which it had formed between them and the mother-country, so, when these relations had been formed, and the colonies had become capable of maintaining a separate existence, it was the true interest of the mother-country, equally as of the colonies, that the connexion should be dissolved, and that they should be allowed to act with the free energies of a distinct community. In effecting the separation a war seems to have been necessary for giving combination to the transatlantic states, which would probably have been else involved in a civil war among themselves. This war had loaded the mother-country with a considerable accumulation of debt; and, though it may well be questioned, whether the additional debt then contracted was not a part of those multiplied combinations, which intertwine the interests of our complex government, yet the immediate pressure constituted a difficulty, which could be removed only by a consummate skill in the management of the public resources.

The new minister was confessedly the individual fitted beyond all others to heal the wounds of his bleeding country, to recruit her strength, and to prepare her for a struggle, in which every energy was to be strained to its utmost exertion. For these great purposes financial ability alone would not have been sufficient. The timid prudence of Walpole was able to extricate the government, when no impending convulsion required, that the powers of the nation should be raised to the capacity of extraordinary efforts. Under his administration accordingly the industry of the country accumulated the treasures of commerce, but its military spirit was suffered to decline; nor did Great Britain recover her rank among the nations of Europe, until the vigour of the elder Pitt had infused a soul into the community. In the union of political firmness with financial ability the later minister was eminently superior to Walpole, whose maxim was never to disturb what was at rest. The king of Prussia, with perhaps affected scorn, called him 'a minister of preparatives.' The appellation itself is a testimony, that he was

alive to the dangers of his country, and eager to avert by seasonable precaution the peril, which, if suffered to approach nearer, it might be difficult to repel. This political precaution was assisted and supported by a commanding eloquence, which could exalt into a magnanimous liberality the sordidness of self-interest, and excite and concentrate the energies of a people. His eloquence was not indeed like that of his father, impetuous and overbearing; but, clothed in a moral dignity, it asserted a calm and temperate dominion. His part however was not, like that of his father, to rouse to sudden and extraordinary exertion a nation corrupted by the enjoyment of a long tranquillity, for his administration had succeeded a period of war, and he had only to maintain during peace the spirit, which had been recently exercised in the war of America.

As the balance of our popular government could not be preserved without an adequate opposition, so was that, which Mr. Pitt encountered, worthy of all his talents. Its general principles were attractive of the popular sentiment, and the triumvirate of genius, by which it was led, was such as perhaps no age or nation could parallel. While its chief leader, Mr. Fox, was eminent for his rapid and persuasive argumentation, and was perhaps yet more distinguished by that irresistible simplicity, which binds the hearts of men in chains indissoluble, he was supported by all that rich variety of talent, which, though necessary to complete the intellectual force of the party, was perhaps incompatible with his own peculiar character. The philosophic fancy of Burke supplied, with inexhaustible profusion, all the principles and the images, which could have any relation to each successive subject of discussion; and, while the wit of Sheridan maintained the ordinary conflict of debate, his classic eloquence was such, that on the memorable trial of Hastings he was honoured with the concurrent admiration of the two great chieftains of the opposing parties. The contentions of such men remind us of the gods of Homer, mingling in the strife of mortals.

The political conduct of Mr. Fox however was appropriate to his position, and characterised him as an able leader of opposition, not as a wise and consistent statesman. He would have exalted the parliament above the crown to secure

his power by the India-bill, and he would have exalted the heir apparent above the parliament to recover it by the regency: he roused the jealousy of the English manufacturers against Ireland in the discussion of the commercial adjustment, and he protested against the union as injurious to the rights of Ireland: he inflamed the selfishness of the merchants against the Russian armament, and concurred with it in applauding the yet more distant and more speculative enterprise of Nootka-Sound: he opposed a French treaty on account of the inevitable and eternal rivalry of the two nations, and he opposed the French war on account of the inoffensive harmlessness of France in a revolutionary and republican excitation. To reconcile these proceedings as the movements of a consistent policy would require more complicated considerations, than philosophy has ever devised for adjusting an erroneous astronomy to the simplicity of the motions of nature.

The first of the measures of Mr. Pitt, when he was established in power, was to provide means for restoring the failing credit of his country, for, though peace had been re-established, it had not brought with it the re-establishment of the finances, which were still inadequate to the expenditure[11]. The deficiency the minister contrived to supply by various regulations for the prevention of smuggling, which had been carried to an alarming extent. A

[11] 'In the year ending January 5th, 1784, the permanent taxes produced very little more than ten millions, which was nearly half a million less than the interest of the public funded debt, the civil list, and the appropriated duties for the payment of which they were the only security. Besides these charges, the annual expenses of the army, navy, ordnance, and miscellaneous services, estimated at four millions, were to be defrayed, for which there was no provision, except the land and malt taxes, voted every year, and producing only two millions and a half. From this comparison of the actual income and unavoidable expenditure of the country, including only the funded part of the public debt, it appears that there was a deficiency of almost two millions a year in the revenue, which was principally owing to a failure in the estimated produce of the taxes imposed by lord North, during the American war. There was also an enormous unfunded debt, the precise amount of which could not at present be ascertained, but which must necessarily be funded, and the interest provided for, so that the whole deficiency could not be considered as less than three millions a year, without any allowance for a sinking fund.'—Bishop Tomline's Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. i. pp. 358, 359.

loan being still necessary for satisfying the public exigencies, he greatly improved the mode of negotiating, by opening the transaction to a public competition, instead of managing it secretly, as had been customary, with a select number of favoured individuals. By this altered arrangement, which from that time has been invariably observed, the most advantageous conditions were procured for the nation, and a source of the most debasing influence was wholly cut off from the patronage of the minister.

The attention of Mr. Pitt was then employed in providing a substitute for the India-bill, which had proved fatal to the power of his predecessor. In the early struggle of his power a plan of this kind had been already proposed without success. The dissolution of the parliament had however removed the impediment by changing the composition of the house of commons; and a new bill, similar in its general principles, but enlarging the powers of the board of control and the governor-general, passed at this time in both houses by great majorities. The principles, upon which the minister challenged a comparison of his bill with that of Mr. Fox, were that he had respected the charter of the company as much[12], as was at all compatible with the interests of the public; and that the power, which it had become necessary to withdraw from the company, he had transferred to the executive authority of the constitution, instead of shackling that authority by the intervention of a parliamentary nomination of commissioners.

In this session, the first in which the power of the minister was established, were laid the foundations of that system of administration, which so wonderfully improved the resources of the nation. By various regulations the finances were recovered from a most alarming depression[13]; by the new method of managing a loan an honest and economical arrangement was substituted for one, which had lavished the property in corrupting the guardians of the people; and by the new form of government constituted

[12] Mr. Pitt left to the company the whole management of the patronage, equally as of the commerce of India.—Bishop Tomline's Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. i. p. 397. [13] In simplifying the collection of the revenue it was found necessary to propose nearly three thousand resolutions.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 19.

for India, the eastern possessions of the empire were as intimately connected with the monarchy, as appeared to be consistent with their peculiar circumstances and character. The prosperity resulting from these measures, enabled the minister, within two years afterwards, to complete the system. The revenue having within that time considerably exceeded the expenditure, he availed himself of the opportunity for creating a sinking-fund on an improved and permanent principle. Such a fund had been originally established by Walpole in the year 1716; but, no precaution having been employed for protecting it from alienation, it had become ineffectual. The new sinking-fund was vested in certain select commissioners, who were required to employ it in a quarterly purchase of stock. The only practicable improvement was adopted in the year 1792, by enacting that, when a new loan should become necessary, an additional fund of one in the hundred should be provided for its discharge.

The question of the regency, which was agitated in the year 1789, when the king had become incapacitated for exercising the executive authority, reversed the positions of the two great leaders of the British parliament, exhibiting Mr. Pitt as the advocate of the rights of the lords and commons[14] in selecting and restricting the person to be intrusted with the office of filling the place of the sovereign, in opposition to Mr. Fox, who contended for the rightful and indivisible transmission of the powers of royalty to the heir apparent of the crown. The dissension, which then occurred between the two contending parties, had an important influence in manifesting the imperfect nature of the connexion subsisting between the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, as it gave occasion to a difference of conduct between the two legislatures. In Great Britain it seems to have served also to rectify the constitutional policy

[14] The conduct of Mr. Pitt on this occasion is represented by Mr. Nicholls as provoked by that of Mr. Fox and his friends. 'Mr. Fox,' says he, 'returned from abroad; the prince gave himself up to his guidance: the injudicious advice of lord Lowborough, the incautious language of Charles Fox, and the folly and arrogance of Mr. Burke and others, brought Mr. Pitt to declare, that although the regency should be vested in the prince of Wales, it should be vested in him with diminished powers.'—Recollections, &c. p. 71.

of the minister, or at least to exhibit him to the people in a constitutional character. He had risen to power on the combined support of the crown and of the people, in opposition to the existing house of commons: it seems as if this special occasion had presented itself, that the same minister might be disposed to seek in turn the support of the legislature, and, if only for his own security, to magnify its powers.

One great measure, originated in the administration of Mr. Pitt, though not perfected until the opposite party had again acquired the temporary possession of power, may fairly be considered as reflecting glory on him, who, in the responsible and embarrassing situation of a minister, gave to it from its earliest discussion, ineffectually indeed, but strenuously and unequivocally, all the support of his talents and personal authority. The trade in the unhappy natives of Africa was in the year 1788 first submitted to the consideration of the parliament by Mr. Pitt[15], in the unavoidable absence of Mr. Wilberforce. On this occasion Mr. Pitt gave an assurance of an early and attentive investigation of the subject. In the year 1791 the abolition of the trade was earnestly, though in vain, recommended by him, as not only demanded by justice, but also consistent with sound policy; and in the following year, while he zealously contended for its immediate extinction, a resolution for suppressing it at a subsequent period was actually carried. There is indeed no reason for supposing, that the influence of his ministerial situation was ever employed in favour of this measure. But it seems to be sufficiently creditable to a minister, who relied so much on the confidence of the mercantile interest of the country, that he should, without any reserve, have given to this great revolution of commerce all the assistance of his talents and the authority of his name. The gradual progress too, which the measure

[15] 'The first public attempt to put a stop to this traffic, was made by the quakers of the southern provinces of (North) America, who, soon after the establishment of American independence, presented addresses for that purpose to their several legislative assemblies; and, in 1787, the same sect in England, following the example of their American brethren, presented a similar petition to the house of commons.'—Bishop Tomline's Mem. of Mr. Pitt, vol. ii. pp. 93, 94. It was abolished in the year 1807.

appears to have made towards its completion, seems to justify the persuasion, that his support was really, though slowly, efficacious, and that he prepared the way for the success, with which it was finally crowned.

The foreign policy of Mr. Pitt, in this period of his administration, appears to be capable of abiding the most jealous examination. By the firmness of his representations, in the year 1787, he restrained the government of France from giving support to the malecontents of the Dutch republic: by yet more active measures, in the year 1790, he vindicated the honour of his country against the grasping ambition of Spain, which had prompted hostilities at Nootka-Sound, on the north-western coast of America: and in the year 1791, though he was forced to yield to the clamour of the opposition, he in no inconsiderable degree succeeded in repressing, by another armament, an ambitious enterprise commenced by Russia against Turkey. The wisdom of his policy in this last instance was indeed denied by his opponents, who had given their approbation to his conduct in the others. They objected to it, that he was involving his country in a war for the disputed possession of a savage desert, and for supporting infidels against a Christian people, while the true interest of the nation required a close connexion with Russia. To these representations however it was answered, that the alienation of Russia had been manifested in the 'armed neutrality' of the north; and that the support of Turkey was a necessary part of a combined system of operations, which by connecting Great Britain, the Dutch provinces, Prussia, Poland, Sweden and Turkey, would draw across Europe a chain of political protection. So strongly was the mind of the minister impressed with the policy of supporting this sextuple alliance, that he regretted in his last hours the weakness, with which he had relinquished his Russian armament, as the only part of his political conduct, of which he saw reason for repenting[16].

In these arrangements of domestic and foreign policy were passed the ten years, which intervened between the wars of the two revolutions of America and France. The growing

[16] This anecdote is given on the authority of the late lord Redesdale, from whom, when he was lord chancellor of Ireland, the author received it.

prosperity of the nation was manifested in the augmented productiveness of the taxes, and in the continually increasing value of the merchandise exported and imported; and in the close of the session of the year 1792, the minister indulged himself in a glowing statement of the advantageous condition of the country, and of the various causes, which had co-operated to raise it to a height so enviable. The season of severe trial, he observed, was at an end. The country had endured a shock of dismemberment, which had seemed to threaten it with irrecoverable ruin, and, far from sinking under the blow, had gradually attained to a degree of vigour, which it had never before possessed. The actual state of the country, he remarked in the words of Tacitus, was a state, not of mere desire and hope, but of confidence and strength[17].

Little did the minister then foresee, that even within a year from this time a contest would commence, not for the preservation of a distant dependency, not for the maintenance of a remote and doubtful interest, but even for the security of national existence; not to continue during a few campaigns, and to be terminated as soon as the redundancy of national vigour should have been exhausted on both sides, but seemingly inexpiable and interminable, admitting no compromise, and apparently leading to no conclusion. There never was, said Mr. Pitt in the beginning of the year 1792, a time in the history of this country, when, from the situation of Europe, we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace, than at the present moment; and on the first day of February in the following year war was declared by France against Great Britain and Holland. How does such an issue of his expectation confound the confidence of man, and expose the folly of his short-sighted speculation!

That this war was not, as has often been alleged, provoked by Great Britain, has been abundantly demonstrated. It has been shown that Great Britain did not accept the invitation to be a party to the hostile conference, held at Pilnitz by the emperor and the king of Prussia in August in the year 1791[18]; that towards the close of that summer she pro-

[17] Nunc demum redit animus——nec spem modo ac votum securitas publica, sed ipsius voti fiduciam ac robur assumpserit.—De Vitâ Agricolæ, præf. [18] Marsh's Hist. of the Politics of Great Britain and France, &c., vol. i. p. 36. London, 1800.

tected for France the island of St. Domingo against an overpowering insurrection of the negroes[19], declining to take possession of that colony until war had been declared between the two nations; that in the beginning of the year 1792 she reduced her naval and military establishments[20], and remitted taxes, and was not a party to the treaty of Pavia in March of that year, whereas France at the very same time made preparations for largely augmenting, not only her military, but also her marine force; that in declining to mediate between France and the allied powers of Austria and Prussia in June of the same year[21], she only declined an interposition, by which France designed to involve her in the war as an ally, the war being a measure of the French policy to favour the progress of the revolution, and the mediation not having been desired by the allied powers, that the recall of the British ambassador after the dethronement of the king of France was, in the actual state of that country, a measure of necessity[22], and not accompanied by any circumstance of hostility; that in the same summer she declined to join the powers confederated against France[23]; that before the end of November[24], Savoy had been incorporated with France, in contradiction to the formal renunciation of all plans of conquest, Belgium declared independent under the protection of France, and the navigation of the Scheldt opened in disregard of all the existing relations of Europe;

[19] Marsh's Hist. of the Politics of Great Britain and France, &c., vol. i. pp. 43, &c. [20] Ibid., pp. 66, &c. [21] Ibid., pp. 117, &c. In regard to this matter Mr. Marsh has proved, that the war with Austria was provoked by the French government to favour the abolition of royalty. War was declared by the French in April, and royalty was abolished in the following August.—Ibid., pp. 132, &c. 'Peace,' said Roland, 'is out of the question: we have three hundred thousand men in arms; we must make them march as far as their legs will carry them, or they will return and cut our throats.' [22] Ibid., pp. 163, &c. In the list of grievances alleged against the British government, at the time of the declaration of war, there is none prior to the recall of lord Gower. [23] Ibid., p. 172, note. [24] Ibid., pp. 187, &c. A defensive treaty had in the year 1788 been concluded between Great Britain and the Dutch states, by which Great Britain was specially bound to protect all the franchises and liberties of the latter, of which that which they exercised over the Scheldt was the principal. The Scheldt moreover, when the French had become masters of the Austrian Netherlands, would have afforded a station for French ships of war.—Ibid., pp. 255, 257.

that in the same month the national convention denounced by a formal decree[25], that France was ready to assist every people, which was willing to rebel against its own government, and actually entered into communication with the seditious societies of England, concerting a plot with them in the following month to effect a revolution; that in December the French nation even declared war against any people[26], which should refuse to revolutionise its government; that on the thirteenth of January in the year 1793 it was acknowledged that Great Britain had to that time observed a strict neutrality[27]; and that on the first of February war was declared[28], not by Great Britain against France, but by France against Holland and Great Britain. These considerations are in this place important, not for the vindication of the British government, which is not the object proposed, but to explain the nature of the great struggle which ensued, by showing that the war was in its spirit and character but a development of that democratic violence, which had been generated in the destruction of the monarchy of France.

In the commencement of this great struggle the present review of modern history finds its termination. The federative system of Europe was then dissolved, as the government, by which it had, in its more perfect form, been chiefly supported, was also ruined. It is indeed matter of deep and interesting reflection, that the government of Great Britain, far from participating in the previous tendency to decay, had advanced through the preceding century in a scarcely interrupted progress of improvement. While France was gradually sinking into a dissolution of its principles, and the federal combinations of the continent were so relaxed, as to afford no reasonable hope of protection, the British empire improved its arrangements and augmented its resources; and even amidst the struggle, in which it was at length engaged with its great adversary, it availed itself of

[25] Marsh's Hist. of the Politics of Great Britain and France, &c., vol. i. pp. 199, &c. [26] Ibid., pp. 314, &c. It was afterwards pretended that this decree was applicable only to those, who, after having conquered their liberty, may request the fraternity and assistance of the French republic, by a solemn and unequivocal expression of the general will. But Mr. Marsh has exposed the falsehood of this allegation.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 43. [27] Ibid., vol. i. p. 76, note.
[28] Ibid., p. 262.

the very alarm and danger of its situation, to complete the concentration of its power by the incorporating union of Ireland. This empire had indeed suffered a temporary depression, while it was throwing off dependencies, which had then attained to maturity, and in the continuance of the connexion would have occasioned only embarrassment and confusion; but it recovered rapidly from the distress of the separation, and was raised to a prosperity unexampled in the history of human policy, just when only the existence of such a government could stem the progress of ruin, and preserve for another period of history the hopes of mankind. The war, so long waged between these two great nations, was accordingly the struggle of all the political and moral machinery of improved society against the brute force of a nation, which had first destroyed its own government, and then armed itself against the repose and happiness of the surrounding countries. That struggle has long since been completed in the final discomfiture of France. What new order of things may at length arise out of the ruin of the former system, it is not for human wisdom to anticipate.

The period of the later and better arrangement of the political interests of Europe has bequeathed to succeeding ages a rich inheritance of science, which in Great Britain has received a continued augmentation, even since that arrangement has been destroyed, as the British empire almost alone of the European governments was not overwhelmed in the general ruin. Chemistry in particular has within that period first assumed a scientific form, and has subsequently been wonderfully extended by new discovery. In forming this inheritance various countries have contributed to increase the stores of genius, but we find in Great Britain both the commencement of chemical science and its grand improvement, the latter connected with the name of Davy, which is now placed beside that of her own Newton in the records of philosophy.

Assisted by the discovery of Leibnitz, which had provided a new and more convenient method of analysis, the mathematicians of the continent prosecuted with admirable ingenuity and success the researches of the English philosopher into the laws which regulate the structure of the universe. In these inquiries the names of Clairaut, D'Alembert, Euler,

Lagrange, and Laplace have become *illustrious*, the last of these great men more especially having demonstrated [29] the unalterable permanence of those laws, though Newton had apprehended a tendency towards disorder and confusion. In Great Britain also the interest in the study of the mathematical sciences, which the fame of Newton had excited, long continued to divert the attention of students from experimental enquiry. This was first prosecuted with success by Black of Edinburgh [30], and by Cavendish and Priestley of England, after the middle of the eighteenth century. The first of this eminent triumvirate was distinguished especially by his theory of *latent* heat, the others by their discoveries concerning the natures of the elastic fluids denominated *gases*. The materials furnished by these philosophers enabled Lavoisier of France [31], though without sufficient acknowledgment [32], to construct the first sound theory of chemistry [33],

[29] See General Conclusion, note 7. [30] This philosopher was born in France in the year 1728, of a Scotish family. His theory of *latent* heat he appears to have brought to maturity between the years 1759 and 1763.—Thomson's Hist. of Chemistry, vol. i. pp. 313, 319. Lond., 1830. Mr. Cavendish was born in London in the year 1731. His first communication 'on fictitious air,' was published in the Philosophical Transactions in the year 1766.—Ibid., pp. 336, 339. Doctor Priestley was born in Yorkshire in the year 1733. His first chemical treatise was published in the year 1772.—Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 1, 18.

[31] He was born in Paris in the year 1743. His first chemical volume was published in the year 1774, towards the end of which year doctor Priestley made a communication to him in Paris, which suggested his theory of combustion and calcination.—Ibid., vol. i. pp. 75, 77, 78. Like Archimedes, he perished by a violent death, supplicating in vain for a little time, in which he might prepare a statement of the results of some experiments, which he had just completed.—Ibid., p. 128. In the barbarism of the tyranny of Robespierre science was an unpardonable crime. [32] Ibid., pp. 89, 92, 106. [33] This was denominated the *antiphlogistic* theory, in contradistinction to that of *phlogiston*, or the principle of inflammability, which was first proposed by Beccher, born at Spires in Germany in the year 1635, and then improved by Stahl, born at Anspach in the year 1660, from whom it has been commonly denominated the Stahlian theory. The difference between the two theories is briefly this, that according to the earlier a body is conceived to be deprived in combustion of a component principle, whereas according to the later a component part of the atmosphere is conceived to be combined with it. The *phlogistic* theory was abandoned, though not without a protracted struggle, when it was perceived that a body after combustion is heavier than in its previous state.—Thomson, vol. i. pp. 246, 250; vol. ii. pp. 99, 100. The theory of Lavoisier has however

explaining the processes of combustion and calcination by the combination of a component part of the atmospheric air with the bodies burned or reduced to *calces*. In the mean time Galvani and Volta had in Italy made a discovery[34], which connected chemistry with electricity, and furnished Davy with a new and more powerful instrument of experimental analysis [35], for making new discoveries of the composition of bodies. The loss of this illustrious man the philosophic world has now to deplore, and that also of Wollaston, who has enriched science with numerous inventions in almost every department[36]. But England has still her Herschel, the worthy son of a distinguished father, who has combined the profound meditations of philosophy with the

since been limited by the discovery of two facts: 1st, that combustion is not necessarily accompanied by an absorption of oxygen; 2nd, that acids exist independently of oxygen.—Report of the British Association, pp. 70, 71. Lond., 1833. [34] This arose from a controversy maintained, about the year 1790, between Galvani and Volta, two Italian philosophers. The former, who was a professor of anatomy, discovered accidentally that, if the crural nerve, going into the muscles of a frog and the crural muscles, be laid bare immediately after death, and a piece of zinc be placed in contact with the nerve, and a piece of silver or copper, with the muscle, when these two pieces of metal are made to touch each other, violent convulsions are produced in the muscle, which cause the limb to move. Galvani conceived that the convulsions were caused by the discharge of a nervous energy from the muscles, Volta by the passage of a current of common electricity.—Thomson, vol. ii. pp. 251, 252. To doctor Wollaston is owed the first demonstration of the identity of the galvanic and the electric principles.—Ibid., p. 249. This new power is described by Sir J. Herschell, as one by whose means those effects, which had before been crowded within an inappreciable instant, could be developed in detail, and studied at leisure; and those forces, which had previously exhibited themselves only in a state of uncontrollable intensity, were tamed down, as it were, and made to distribute their efficacy over an indefinite time, and to regulate their action at the will of the operator.—Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Nat. Phil. in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia, pp. 335, 336. London, 1830. [35] According to Sir Humphrey Davy, chemical affinity is only a result of opposite states of electricity in various degrees of intensity. This was established in an essay, inserted in the Philosophical Transactions for the year 1807.—Thomson, vol. ii. pp. 260, 261.

[36] Optics and chemistry are the sciences, which lie under the greatest obligations to him. To his discovery of a method of reducing platina to ingots in a state of purity, the present accuracy of chemical investigation must be ascribed, this material having been since used in making vessels for chemical purposes.—Ibid., p. 248.

elegant refinement of literature. In him too she may be said to possess a plurality of philosophers, for he has been eminent at once in chemistry, in practical optics and the theory of light, and, like his father, in astronomy; and that any person may enter into competition with him in any part of science, is the result only of the variety of the objects, which his comprehensive intellect has embraced. He has also recently instructed the world in a review of the present state of physical science [37], in which he has distinctly illustrated by a wide retrospect of past discovery those rules of experimental enquiry, which the genius of Bacon, two centuries before, had darkly anticipated. Nor should this catalogue of philosophic genius be concluded, without honourable mention of the late Mr. Dalton, the author of the *atomic theory*, or rather the discoverer of the law of definite proportions in the composition of bodies, to which he had been conducted by that theory.

Astronomy, aided by the invention of the telescope, had in the seventeenth century proceeded to the discovery of the satellites of Jupiter [38], which fully established the Copernican system of our universe, afforded the first astronomical solution of the great problem of terrestrial longitude, and, towards the close of that century, enabled Roemer to discover and to estimate, by the retardation of their eclipses, the amazing velocity of light. In the eighteenth the discovery of Roemer, which philosophers had hesitated to admit [39], as announcing a velocity approaching to infinite, was more than forty years afterwards confirmed by Bradley, in discerning the aberration of the light of a star, occasioned by the composition of its motion with that of the earth in striking the eye of the observer. The observations of the elder Herschell subsequently enlarged our system by the discovery of [40] one primary and of eight secondary planets; and they were then extended into the boundless regions of space, his powerful telescope penetrating the depths of the starry heavens, and giving a beginning to the sidereal astronomy, which has

[37] Preliminary Discourse, etc. [38] Mr. Herschel's Address on presenting the honorary medals of the Astronomical Society of London, pp. 132, 133. Mem. of the Astron. Society, vol. iii. part i. [39] Not only Cassini, Maraldi and Fontenelle, but even Hooke himself.—Ibid.

[40] Four primary planets have since been discovered.

since been prosecuted with success[41]. Adopting an opinion, suggested by professor Kant and the celebrated Lambert, that all the bodies in the universe are distributed into *nebulæ*, one of which contains the solar system, Sir William Herschell examined not fewer than two thousand five hundred of these *nebulæ*, to which his son has added five hundred more. In observing our own he was led to conclude that the solar system is progressive through it, and that stars apparently double are in truth binary systems[42], in each of which two luminous bodies revolve round their common centre of gravity. In surveying others he imagined that he had penetrated even into the secrets of creation[43]. Having seen the luminous element in one place diffused without any observable conformation, in another indicating an imperfect disposition to agglomerate into a mass of fuller brightness, in a third exhibiting a formed body of light, though not distinctly detached from the surrounding element, in a fourth presenting a well-defined disc, separated from the diffused light, out of which it appeared to have coalesced, and lastly, by an increased condensation, approaching nearly to the appearance of a star. It is however anticipated, that the stupendous telescope constructed by the Earl of Rosse, will dissipate the notion of the existence of diffused light and of the progressive formation of the luminaries of the universe.

Art, perhaps even more than science, has given by its prodigious improvement an honourable distinction to the period now concluded, the invention of the steam-engine having introduced into mechanics a power far exceeding all enginery previously known, and alike applicable to every operation. In the year 1763 James Watt[44], a Scotchman of

[41] Especially by his son, now Sir John Frederic William Herschel.

[42] In one instance a system of three luminous bodies so revolving was discovered. [43] Astronomical Observations relating to the Construction of the Heavens, &c.—Philos. Trans. of the Royal Society for the year 1811, part ii. Herschel also noted the appearance of a luminous ring resembling that of Saturn, not connected with a central body.

[44] Lardner's Popular Lectures on the Steam-Engine, pp. 57, &c. London, 1828. Rees's Cyclopedia, art. *Steam-engine*. The marquess of Worcester, who published his Century of Inventions in the year 1683, is intitled to the credit of having suggested the use of the elastic force of steam, as a first mover in a machine for raising water. Captain Savery, about the year 1698, proceeded a step further, discovering the method of producing a vacuum by the condensation of steam, and thus

no scientific education, but of a genius not requiring such an aid, having been employed to repair an engine worked by atmospheric pressure, in which however steam was employed to generate a vacuum, turned his attention to the consideration of preventing the great consumption and waste of this new agency. Having, with this view, thought of the expedient of condensing the steam in a separate cylinder, he was at once led onward to his great invention, by which steam was alternately applied, as a moving power, both above and below the piston. The year 1774 was distinguished by completing it in the actual construction of a large engine; and about five years afterwards it received from its author the important improvement, by which the reciprocating was converted into a circular movement, and it became fitted for actuating machinery. In the year 1802 the steam-engine appears to have been successfully employed for propelling a vessel on the Forth-and-Clyde navigation, but the practice was discontinued on account of the damage, which it threatened to the banks of the canal by the surge of the water. Steam-navigation was then brought into use on the river Hudson in North America, and in the year 1812 on the Clyde in Scotland, from which time it has been so rapidly extended, as to have been already introduced into almost every region of the civilised world. The same power has in England been applied to the conveyance of goods and passengers by land, in which it has greatly exceeded all that could be effected by horses, both in rapidity of motion and in the weight to be conveyed. Unerring in the most delicate processes of manufacture, and yet of power to perform the most laborious operations[45], this noble engine embraces

giving effect to the pressure of the atmosphere. A third step was taken by Newcomen and his associate Cawley, in introducing a piston, which was completed about the year 1713. It still remained, during fifty years, to construct an engine, in which, while a vacuum is produced on the one side of a piston by the condensation of steam, the elastic pressure of steam should be employed as a moving power on the other; and to devise all the beautiful contrivances, by which this power is applied, regulated, and economised. [45] It appears that an engine, employed in pumping water from a mine in Cornwall, raised at each stroke, by five lifts of pumps, a column of water eight hundred and ninety-nine feet and one inch long, and weighing seventy thousand seven hundred and thirty-one pounds. The usual rate of working was about six strokes and a half in each minute.—Philosophical Magazine,

the whole compass of the mechanic art. The finest fabrics are rendered cheap for the purposes of commerce; the deepest mines are freed from the water, which obstructs the workmen; the press has acquired a new facility for propagating its commanding influence; the interior communications of a country are prodigiously multiplied by the rapidity and the force of conveyance; and the ship is now urged through the waves almost with the regularity and the precision of a journey performed on the land.

With this exclusively British invention, so powerfully influencing all the concerns of nations, is aptly concluded this review of the history of an empire, which has done so much for the improvement of human society. Forming within itself by various combinations a balanced government of general liberty, constructing also the only stable system of regulation for the preservation of a protestant faith, extending into every region of the earth the advantages of an unceasing commerce, giving existence to a great republic in the wilds of the western continent, introducing among the oppressed millions of India the blessings of public order and education, renouncing the trade of slavery and labouring for the civilisation of the wretched Africans, constituting a new people among its antipodes even from the outcasts of its own society, and furnishing at the same time to Europe, and to the world, the principles of a genuine philosophy, the most splendid discoveries of science, and the most curious and important invention of art, the British empire claims to be regarded as the most interesting object in merely human history. If the system of Europe had been only shown to have acted as a *matrix*, for generating this government, its utility might have been deemed to be sufficiently established. Much more however has been effected by that great confederation of states, for it has also maintained the general independence of the European nations, and thus fitted them for attaining all the improvement, of which they were severally capable.

June, 1830, art. lxi. "It is well known to modern engineers," says Sir J. F. W. Herschell, "that there is *virtue* in a bushel of coals properly consumed, to raise seventy millions of pounds weight a foot high. This," he adds, "is actually the average effect of an engine at this moment working in Cornwall. Prel. Disc., etc. p. 59.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

A SURVEY of history has now been completed, comprehending the transactions of all the nations of the earth during thirteen centuries, and reaching to the commencement of the present revolutionary period. The object proposed was to determine, whether such an order and combination of events can be discovered in the history of mankind, as, while it illustrated the operation of political and moral causes, might also exhibit a plain demonstration of the providential government of the world, and thus lead the minds of men to the contemplation of its great Author. Though in details so numerous and so various particular facts may have been misconceived, or inferences insecurely collected, still enough might remain to establish the truth of the principles, and to demonstrate the government of an almighty ruler. Newton has been proved to have erred in concluding, that the motions of the planetary system tend continually to decay, yet the principles of his philosophy are imperishable truths, and have even supplied the means of detecting and correcting the error.

The works of the material creation, though 'they have neither speech nor language,' yet utter voices, which proclaim to reflecting minds the glory of their Maker. Can it be supposed, that the beings, to whom these voices are addressed, should themselves, in their moral and political order, present no manifestations of the attributes of God? Must it be believed, that the Almighty, when he had impressed on mere matter the character of his perfections, abandoned his intelligent creatures to their own errors, contenting himself with some occasional interposition, when those errors had become extreme? As this is not agreeable to analogy, so neither is it conformable to the lessons of the sacred scriptures. In them we are assured that an event the most unimportant, the fall of a sparrow, does not happen without the knowledge and permission of our heavenly Father, and we have received this assurance, not as a merely specu-

lative communication concerning the divine government, but that we may apply it to our own conduct, and rely with confidence on the divine protection.

This conclusion receives an additional confirmation from the absurdity of the contrary opinion. If a harmony of action, tending to general improvement, has been demonstrated in the very numerous and various transactions of thirteen centuries of the history of the world, can it be imagined that this harmony should have been the result of the independent agencies of a vast multitude of weak, ignorant, and corrupt creatures, living in different ages, and in remote and unconnected countries? This supposition would require that weakness and ignorance should, without the possibility of a concerted plan, and without the superintendence of a controlling power, have steadily and consistently operated to the attainment of an end, to which only the wisdom and power of a supreme ruler could be adequate; and that not only the imperfect virtue, but even the positive viciousness of man, should have uniformly laboured for the accomplishment of a purpose worthy of infinite goodness.

It may indeed easily be understood, that a large portion of time must have elapsed, and a great variety of events must have occurred, before sufficient materials could be supplied to the speculative enquirer, for enabling him to discover the plan of the moral government of God. In the movements of the material world there is nothing essentially progressive. All is regular and immutable; and, except in the case of those minute variations, which on account of their long periods have been denominated secular, the periods of the planetary system do not embrace any considerable portion of duration. The moral and political history of our species, on the contrary, is in its nature progressive, as the beings, of which it is composed, are capable of continual improvement. The subject of enquiry is therefore continually changing before our eyes, without any return to a former condition. Our research must accordingly be directed to the discovery of combination in extensive and various ranges of action; and some great period of human history must have been brought to an apparent conclusion, some important crisis of a large and influential portion of human society must have occurred, before man could be enabled to form

a sound judgment concerning the principles and the laws of human improvement.

If it should be thought that of a system essentially, and at all times, progressive no satisfactory judgment can be formed, until its whole period shall have been completed in the final consummation of all things, an answer may be supplied even from the analogy of the material universe. In the planetary system itself there are periods, which are yet far from being completed, the variations denominated secular extending even to a duration[1], of which the time elapsed since the earliest observations has constituted but a very small portion. Astronomers have however been enabled, by the observation of other movements comprehended within narrow limits, to ascertain the principles by which all are regulated, and to predict the accomplishment of those, which remain to be completed. In the case of a system essentially progressive we must indeed be unable to pronounce with distinctness on its future changes; but we may reasonably expect to be so far instructed by the study of the order and combination of past events, as to be assured that the same principles of moral government shall hereafter be observed in the superintendence of the affairs and interest of mortals.

That some correspondence should exist between the material universe and the moral system, is rendered probable by this consideration, that both have been the works of the same Creator. The same Being, who distributed matter according to his pleasure into the masses of the material universe, formed also men, who, acting agreeably to their capacities and circumstances, have distributed themselves into aggregates, which constitute the moral system of human society. Both systems, it is admitted, are subject to the providential government of the one Being, by whom both have been created, and from whom both have received the powers by which they act, exercising in the mutual relations of their parts reciprocal influences. It is therefore not unreasonable to conclude, that the common Creator of the two systems may have chosen to regulate his superintendence of both by some common principles, accommodated indeed to

[1] Traitè Elémentaire d'Astronomiè Physique, par Biot, p. 374. Paris, 1811.

their respective natures, but still sufficiently indicating that they had derived their existence from a common source.

This persuasion is agreeable to the ordinary conceptions of men, when they reflect on political subjects. The balance of power, a phrase adopted from mechanical disquisitions, is familiar to every one, who speaks of the reciprocal relations of states. It has even been not unusual to illustrate the details of these relations by allusions to the planetary movements, or to the science of *dynamics*, which treats of the forces of inanimate bodies. A new government, it is thus said[2], must conform to the existing relations of other states, as the newly discovered planets are observed to obey the same general laws, by which the motions of the others had been known to be regulated. The derangements also of the general order, produced by the influences of individual peculiarities, have been compared to the friction, and other resistance, for which allowance must be made in applying to practical purposes the principles of mechanical science.

These expressions, instead of being merely phrases of illustration, borrowed from other considerations familiar to the mind, may appear to receive a direct justification from an analysis of the subject, to which they have been thus applied.

As human societies are composed of individual agents, each of whom separately regulates his own conduct according to his own views and circumstances, the laws of the moral system should be sought, not in the movements of great masses of men, but in the separate agencies, of which these movements are collectively composed. In this respect the moral possesses the advantage of superior simplicity in the comparison with the physical system, the same laws, which determine the actions of the minute parts of societies, determining also the collective agencies of the aggregates; whereas, in the physical universe, the laws of gravitation, which regulate the movements of masses of matter, though they are also applicable to their component parts, are yet in the latter case blended with the differing laws of other forces. The affinities of chemical attraction have been

[2] Brougham's Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers, vol. i. pp. 209, 245.

identified with electricity, and the magnetic influence may perhaps be reducible to the same principle; but gravity still remains distinct from this pervading power, as also from that corpuscular attraction, by which the solid masses of matter are united.

The fundamental principle of the Newtonian system of the world is, that the path of every revolving body is determined by the combined action of two forces, one of which is the continued attraction of some other body, or system of bodies, round the centre of which a revolution is performed, and the other a force conceived to have been impressed upon it only at the moment when it began to move, and in some direction transverse to the action of the former. Of these two forces one, namely the attraction of the central body, or system of bodies, is determined by the general laws, which the Deity has imposed upon matter; the other, namely the force, with which the revolving body is conceived to have been projected, cannot be referred to any such law, but is considered as determined for each body by the choice of the Deity, as he determined the path, in which he willed that the body should be moved. Again, the projection of a planet is conceived to have been determined by the free choice of the Deity, not simply, but in three several respects. In the first place, the determination of the distance from a central body is not reducible to any known law of matter, nor does it appear to have been the effect of any known force. A certain harmony has indeed been discovered to exist[3], though not very accurately, among the distances of the planetary system, by the consideration of which astronomers were led to look for the very minute planets recently discovered; but no reason is known, why those distances should not be considered as arbitrarily determined. They are therefore referred to the immediate choice of the Deity. In the second place, the quantity of the velocity, communicated at the moment of projection, appears also, for a similar reason, to have been determined in the same manner. Lastly, the direction, in which that velocity is communicated, appears likewise to have been freely chosen. Any of these particulars being changed, the path described by the revolving body would

[3] Astronomie Theorique et Practique par M. Delambre, tome ii. pp. 549, 550. Paris, 1814.

also be changed. If the revolving body were projected at a different distance, it would be subjected to a greater or less force of attraction; if the velocity communicated in the projection were greater or less, the result of its combination with the same attractive force would be accordingly varied; if the direction, in which the velocity is communicated, were different, so that it should be more or less obliquely combined with the attracting force of the central body, the result of the combination would by this difference also be altered.

In the moral, as in the material world, there is a general influence, to which each part is subjected, as soon as it has been formed, and has entered into combination with the rest. The man is affected by the social influence of the community, in which he lives, as the planet by gravitating towards the other bodies of the planetary system. This influence is not indeed fixed and invariable in the moral, as in the material world, because man is a being susceptible of change, and the social influence of a community must vary, according as the community is more or less advanced in social improvement. Nor is it intended to be understood, that in all similar circumstances of the moral world similar effects must of necessity be produced, as in the mutual action of unintelligent beings. The free agency of man must be maintained by every one, who attends to his own consciousness of thought and will, and is solicitous for the maintenance of the obligations of virtue. But it is sufficiently apparent, that men in similar circumstances, though acting with freedom, will generally choose to act in the same manner, except so far as the peculiar characters of individuals may influence their determinations, because freedom of choice does not imply, that a moral agent should act by caprice, or in disregard of the motives, by which men are commonly actuated. There are laws of moral, as of physical action; and a knowledge of human life is accordingly manifested in determining, what conduct might reasonably be expected from any individual in certain circumstances of society.

As there are general laws, according to which the influence of social life is exercised, so, it is conceived, are there also peculiarities of individual nature, which must be believed to have been received immediately from the will of the Creator.

He must be strongly disposed to generalise his observations, who will maintain, that the original dispositions and powers of all men are similar, attributing wholly to the influences of surrounding circumstances the diversities manifested in their progress through life. According to this opinion, the keen penetration of the man of abstract science, the fanciful vision of the poet, the impassioned declamation of the orator, the practical wisdom of the statesman, the comprehensive view and prompt decision of the military commander, have all been formed by diversity of situation out of the same materials, which furnish also the abundant supply of mediocrity to fill the ranks of human life, of the follies too, which render society ridiculous, and of the vices, which render it corrupt. But whoever closely observes a number of children nurtured and educated together, will discover among them an original diversity inconsistent with this opinion, and leading him to consider the varieties of human character as resulting primarily from the immediate appointment of God. The powers of the intellect and imagination, and the impulses of passion, appear to be assigned in various measure and combination to each individual at his birth, as constituting his future character, which he is bound, as a moral agent, to improve, or to control, by his own voluntary exertions, but cannot in any case suppress.

It appears then that the operations of the social, like those of the material system, are the results of the combination of two distinct forces, one of which is subjected to general laws, the other is in each separate instance determined by the immediate appointment of the Deity. In the motion of a planet we discover the compounded influence of the attraction of a central body, or system of bodies, regulated by the laws of gravitation, and of a force of protection, which seems to have been impressed immediately by the Creator. In the moral progress also of each individual through his social existence we observe a compounded agency of two forces, the influence exercised upon the individual by his social relations, and the original force of character, which he had brought into existence, the former of which is regulated by the general laws of the moral world, the latter is peculiar to the individual, as the immediate gift of God. The moral agent is thus sent into society impressed with some certain power of intellect,

or measure of temperament, which may be regarded as his force of projection, and is then left to be influenced by the action of the social system, of which he has been in some part or other, as it pleased the Almighty, constituted a member.

Nor does the analogy of the two systems appear to be limited to this general correspondence, but to extend itself even to their details, however these must be in some respects dissimilar. The projection of a planet in the material system appears, as has been remarked, to have been determined by the free choice of the Deity in three several respects; namely, the distance from a central body, or from the common centre of a system of bodies, the quantity of velocity impressed in the projection, and the direction, in which the planet is, as it were, launched forth by the Creator. To each of these three particulars we may in the moral system find something analogous. The first and the third appear to correspond to the determination of the social circumstances, in which each individual is placed at his birth; the second bears an obvious relation to the native force of character, with which each individual is originally endowed.

It may easily be admitted, that a greater or less distance from those places, in which the collective powers of a social system are concentrated, must have in the moral order an effect very directly corresponding to that of a greater or less distance from an attracting body in the material system, as it would tend to determine, with what force an individual so placed might act upon the society, or the society upon the individual. The inhabitant of a metropolis and the inhabitant of a remote province of the same government, or of a dependent colony, may thus be compared to bodies revolving at very different distances from the same central mass. The former would be both subjected to a stronger influence from his social connexions, and enabled to act with more power, in modifying by his efforts the society of which he is a member.

To the greater or less obliquity, in which the velocity of projection has been impressed on a planet, it may be deemed a sufficient correspondence, that, according as an individual has been originally placed in a situation more or less elevated, so does his peculiar force of character enter

more or less directly into combination with the general influence of society, and thus again is it determined, with what power the individual and the society may be mutually affected by their reciprocal action. At the same distance from the centre of a society, two individuals in different stations of life, though originally endowed with characters and powers precisely similar, must be differently affected by the social influence of the community, and must act upon it in their turn with different efficacy, as two planetary bodies, projected from the same point with equal velocities, but in different directions, enter into different combinations of forces, and describe different orbits round the central body, affecting also that body itself with different reactions.

Little needs to be said, to show how the native force of the character of an individual corresponds to the velocity impressed upon a planet in the moment of projection. It is obvious to general observation, that some individuals do, by the power of their original endowments, acquire a social importance, which others in similar circumstances do not even aspire to attain. From some remote and retired village, and from the disadvantage of humble poverty, one individual will by this primary endowment of character make his way to that importance, which for others, even of considerable talent, seems to demand the assistance of the most favourable circumstances.

While the material and the moral system appear to correspond in these particulars, it must be supposed that important differences do also exist between a system of masses of inanimate matter, and another composed of living, intelligent, and free agents. These are now to be considered, that it may be seen, that as much analogy is discoverable between the two systems, as the natural difference of inanimate masses and of moral agents can be conceived to admit, the correspondence failing only where it is manifestly precluded by that difference.

The component parts of the moral differ from those of the material system in two important particulars: first, that the individuals composing the former are continually coming into, or going out of existence; and, secondly, that each individual is, by the nature of moral agency, susceptible of

change, either by improvement, or by deterioration. In the moral system of human society, death is continually removing some individuals, while others are as constantly born into the world, either to occupy the places of the deceased, or to add to the general pŏpulation, whereas in the material universe the parts are generally permanent, and from age to age continue to constitute, with little alteration, the same masses. Each individual also in the former experiences a perpetual change, of some kind or other, as he exercises, abuses, or neglects, his natural powers, and as he is affected, whether usefully or hurtfully, by the influence of the community, of which he is a member. Every society is accordingly an aggregate continually changing, both because its component parts are continually varied, and also because the parts, while they remain, are liable to alteration, whether for good or for evil.

From these two differences it arises that, though in the material system the forces may have been impressed on the masses in their collective state, because they are permanent and invariable, yet in the moral the impression must be made on the parts separately and individually, the aggregates having no unalterable form. A projectile velocity may have been communicated to a planetary body by a single impulse, and the effect of the impulse be permanent, because the body is permanent and unchanged. For determining the operations of a society a character is communicated separately to each individual, and the operations of the society are the results of the combined action of all its parts, varying therefore with the change of the individuals, of which it is composed, as they are removed by death and replaced by others, in greater or less number, and as each individual undergoes a change of character. Though therefore an analogy exists between a system of planetary bodies and a system of nations, it is qualified by the mutability necessarily belonging to the latter, and can be considered as subsisting unaltered, only so long as no important change has manifested itself in any of the communities, of which the social system is composed.

It results also from these differences, that the perfection of a moral must differ essentially from that of a physical

system. The perfection of a system of unintelligent matter requires an unalterable constancy of all its operations. It was believed by Newton, that the motions of the planetary system tended continually, though slowly, towards decay and disorder, and would from time to time require, that the Creator should interpose to rectify his work. A more perfect knowledge of the theory of these motions has however since established the conclusion, that all the irregularities, arising from the reciprocal action of the parts of the system, are but temporary perturbations, and indicate no necessity of occasional interposition. The moral system is, on the contrary, essentially changeable, and its perfection consists, not in a recurrence to a former state, by which its irregularities should be corrected, but in a progress of general improvement, interrupted only by such vicissitudes, as might be eventually instrumental to the melioration of society.

The capacity of collective improvement in societies arises primarily from the nature of the intelligent beings, of which societies are composed. Each mind individually is susceptible of improvement, and a society, or a system of societies, collecting all the scattered improvement of individuals, conveys it to others, as they come forward in succession, who are thereby enabled to begin, where their predecessors ended, and thus to advance in an indefinite progress. Among the savage outcasts of humanity minds may have existed, naturally possessing powers equal to those, by which Newton investigated the secrets of the real world, and Shakespeare gave reality to a world of fiction; but the philosopher had been improved by the transmission of previously acquired science, and the dramatist by the varied exhibition of living characters, in an advanced, but still a picturesque state, of human society.

The mere capacity of improvement however would have been insufficient, if some excitement had not also been provided, to stimulate it into action. This is accordingly supplied by the brevity of human life, which causes a perpetual change and succession of all the component parts of a society. Men are urged to an exertion of their native powers, not by the consciousness of possessing them, which would rarely overcome the love of sensual pleasure, or even the blandishment of ease, but by the hope of succeeding to some

advantage, which should be left vacant by the expected mortality of the present occupant. If all men lived for ever, or even during any period much exceeding the actual duration of human life, the hope of succession would languish, and that industry of exertion, which is now active in securing all the avenues to future wealth and eminence, would become torpid. The brevity of human life is therefore a necessary condition of human improvement. In the first ages the importance of transmitting, with as little error as might be possible, the primitive traditions of men, prevailed over the urgency of stimulating inventive industry, because they had much to learn from those traditions, before inventive industry could be beneficially exercised. In these ages therefore human life was usefully extended to a very long period, so as to require but a very few successions in conveying a tradition to persons living long after the commencement of human society. But when the infancy of mankind was past, the excitement of hope was presented to human exertion, the length of life being so reduced, as to bring within the contemplation of every man the object of his desire.

The brevity of human life has also another very important operation, as it affords frequently recurring opportunities for those changes of the chief agents of human society, who are mainly instrumental to the political and moral revolution of the world. The political associations of men may be regarded as moral machines, by which the powers of individuals are elicited and brought into combined activity. These machines, in the execution of the purposes of a beneficent, but comprehensive providence, require at some times to be impelled by some extraordinary ability, at others to be subjected to some considerable change, or even to be crushed and destroyed; and for all these operations we observe individuals introduced into the world, whose peculiar qualities of genius, or of weakness, of virtue, or even of vice, designate them, though unconscious of the plan and acting freely, as the agents of an order of things, to which they are severally accommodated.

Who can question this adaptation of human agents, when, in a review of history, he sees the highly gifted Charlemagne and Alfred laying the foundations, the one of the general system of the west, the other of the British government;

when he sees the throne of the eastern empire sinking before the army of the Ottomans through the extraordinary weakness of its sovereigns, and the meanness and misconduct of John of England provoking a spirited nobility to vindicate the rights of liberty; when he sees, in other ranks of society, the enthusiasm of Peter the hermit rousing the nations of Christendom to the war of Palestine, the honest independence of Luther rejecting the abuses of the church of Rome, and the bigotted cruelty of the duke of Alva exciting the traders of the Netherlands to form a new government for the protection of freedom civil and religious? A close examination must indeed convince every impartial enquirer, that, however the mass of a community may be supposed to be an aggregate of various agencies, reduced by their combination to a common standard of ordinary qualities, yet the individuals, who appear on the surface of history, are all peculiarly endowed for the situations, in which they act, and are all removed from the world, as the changing circumstances of society may require.

The moral system, being thus composed of societies continually changed, not only admits, but by its nature even demands, a perpetual interposition of a controlling power for the introduction of suitable agents, and thus becomes more especially the subject of a providential government. Since the characters of the individuals, to be from time to time introduced into the world, require to be accommodated to the situations, in which they are to be placed, and in the continually changing circumstances of the moral system that adaptation must be continually diversified, it is essential to the maintenance of such a system, that the providence of God should be continually exercised in determining the native qualities of the persons to be brought into existence, in correspondence to the exigencies of the system, so that they might be instrumental to the plans of infinite wisdom for the general improvement of men.

If then the planetary be compared with the moral system in regard to their general characters, the former will exhibit to us a number of permanent bodies, subjected to invariable laws of physical action, though originally placed by the free choice of the Creator, and by the same choice launched into motion in directions, and with velocities, which no laws of

matter had determined; and the latter will present a number of aggregates of human beings, subjected in the like manner, though not necessarily, and therefore uniformly only in their collective observance, to the laws of social influences, but composed of individuals continually coming into, or going out of existence, and, according to the free appointment of God, endued with such native characters, and born into such circumstances of social connexion, as might best qualify them to fulfil the purposes of his wisdom. In the planetary system the Deity is conceived to abandon a body to the ordinary laws of physical action, when he has once determined its place, and the velocity and direction of its original movement. In the moral system he is conceived to send a human being into the world, having first determined what should be his original powers and dispositions, and in what part of the social order he should begin his progress; and then to leave him to his own agency, subjected to the various influences of society, on which he at the same time acts with reciprocal effect, until it shall suit the designs of the Almighty that he should be withdrawn.

The aggregates constituting the moral system do not indeed display the same regularity, which delights us in contemplating the revolutions of the material world. Composed as they are of moral agents, capable of improvement and of deterioration, they are perpetually changing their characters and operations, and even undergoing new modifications of political existence, and entering into new combinations of policy. The gratification experienced in this case is derived from the survey, not of unerring regularity, but of progressive improvement. As we adore the divine wisdom and power manifested in the orderly arrangement of the material universe, so may we contemplate, with at least equal reverence, that moral superintendence, which conducts man to the perfection of his nature, through all the complicated and varying combinations of his history. It is not for human philosophy to enquire, how far the Deity may choose to influence the minds of individuals in their moral action, as neither have we any means of determining, how far he may think it fitting to interpose in the operations of material nature. The moral system however, subject as it is to a perpetual change of its component parts, and susceptible of

change from the changing qualities of intelligent agents, is immediately dependent on the providence of God for an unremitting superintendence, in preparing and combining its various agencies, as parts of one great and comprehensive plan, which should display the glory of the Creator, by rendering his moral creatures less unworthy of his love.

For illustrating and verifying this philosophy of human society, a very long period of human history has been examined, which seemed to be very distinctly separated by great revolutions from preceding and following events, and thus to be capable of being detached from the general series of human transactions, so that it might be considered as a whole. Through the succession of thirteen centuries a progressive improvement of society has been traced, from the confusion and barbarism of the ruined empire of Rome to the orderly arrangement and the various refinement, moral, intellectual, and social, of the age immediately preceding the present. It has been shown that a new frame of society was gradually formed out of the commixture of the rude barbarians of the north with the corrupted inhabitants of a destroyed empire; that, at the close of three centuries, a new empire was established by Charlemagne, out of which has been slowly developed the modern system of European relations, the primary combination having been constituted by that prince himself, in connecting his imperial dignity with the ecclesiastical presidency of Rome; that the wars of Palestine assisted variously in the arrangement and improvement of the yet ill-regulated and uncultivated nations of the west, the protracted struggle with the Arabs and Moors of Spain introduced habits of intellectual and social refinement, and the subversion of the Greek empire sent into western Europe the precious remains of classical antiquity; that amidst the restored improvement of Italy a system of balanced policy was at length, in the fifteenth century, instituted by Lorenzo de' Medici, and conveyed thence by the wars of Italy to the German empire, which, by the loosened contexture of its government, had been specially prepared for its reception; that the papal dominion, which had first given combination and consistency to the incipient system, and then, by breaking down the imperial authority in Italy and Germany, had given occasion to the commencement of

a balanced policy, did in the sixteenth century, by its aggravated abuses, give occasion also to an ecclesiastical secession, which both developed a purer form of Christian doctrine and worship, and furnished for the new policy the strongest and most pervading principle of political opposition; that voyages of remote discovery about the same time opened to the nations of Europe communications with distant regions, presenting to them new and indefinite resources of power, and preparing a wide and various theatre for the operations of the policy, which had been generated among the petty combinations of the Italian states, and nurtured in the federative constitution of the empire; that, by the treaty of Westphalia in the middle of the seventeenth century, a preparatory system of federative policy was first constituted for Europe, in which Germany held the preeminence of power, and France, connecting itself with the protestant states of the empire, was the opposing, or balancing, government, almost all the other nations of Europe being comprehended within the arrangement; that at the close of the same century this preparatory system was transmuted into another, more perfect in its form, as its central government was France, the most considerable in its intrinsic resources, and as the maritime interests of Europe were brought into a direct combination with those of the continental states, Great Britain being in this new order of policy the opposing power; and, finally, that while these relations of federative connexion were gradually developed among the southern and principal governments, another system was separately combined in the north, the main result of which appears to have been, not the formation of a distinct arrangement of balanced policy, but the aggrandisement of the rude empire of Russia, which in the dissolution of the southern and principal system, has already assisted in rescuing the independence of Europe from the revolutionary violence of France, and may, in the construction of some more comprehensive combination, assume the position and office of the controlling government. Even this recital does not comprehend all the principal conclusions established in the preceding work, for it has been shown that, on the one part, a triple government was, in all its changes instrumental to the due arrangement of the balanced constitution

of the British empire, and that, on the other, Tatary sent forth successively her two conquerors, Zingis-khan and Tamerlane, in accordance with the general plan, and that Persia acted on Turkey as a seasonable countercheck, when the latter would have pressed inconveniently upon the German empire, the generating organ of the common policy of Europe. The plan, which it has been proposed to unfold, is wide as the world. Its combination, if it be indeed combined, sets chance at defiance, and is alike beyond the power and the foresight of man.

That the construction of a system of political equilibrium should be regarded as the consummation of the political and social improvement of this period of history, is deducible from this consideration, that national inprovement is generally promoted most effectually by national independence, and that national independence can be secured only by the protection of a balanced policy. Such a system also supposes such a mutual intercourse of nations, all being vigilantly engaged in observing their respective movements, that whatever improvement may be attained in any one, is promptly communicated to the rest. Cases may indeed occur, in which the improvement of a people is best effected, when it has fallen under the dominion of another. Of this kind seems to be the case of the many millions in India, who are subjected to the liberal policy of the British empire, now anxiously exercised in promoting among them good order and civilisation. Of this kind certainly was the wide domain of ancient Rome, which spread over the earth the knowledge of the arts of life and of the imperial law, and facilitated the propagation of that supremely important knowledge, which the Deity thought fitting to be communicated to his creatures. But the conscious feeling of national independence, and the energy excited by the necessity of defence, are commonly the most efficacious principles of improvement, and must be especially beneficial, when the intimate connexions of a federative policy bring the several states into a familiar communication, and thereby impart to all every improvement, which any one has accomplished.

In establishing therefore throughout Europe a system of federative policy, which, though under a change of form, subsisted from the treaty of Westphalia to the revolution of France, or during a century and a half, much appears to

have been done for the general improvement of that region, in which were collected the ruling influences of the earth. A system had been at length formed, and brought into action, which procured for the least considerable states of Europe as much security, as human policy could bestow, and at the same time rendered familiar to the least improved the superior advantages of the more cultivated and refined. If it be thought that the continuance of such a system of policy through a century and a half is disproportioned to the long preparation, represented as occupying the remainder of thirteen, it should be considered that, though the system thus at length combined, was dissipated in the wars of the French revolution, yet its principles and its habits still subsist among nations, and will enable them to enter into new combinations of policy, accommodated to their altered circumstances and relations, as soon as they shall have settled into the new forms which they may have received in a protracted period of revolutionary agitation. The efficacy of what was then done, is therefore not lost to the world by the dissolution of the system heretofore constituted. We may, on the contrary, regard the brief period of that system, as the time of preparation for another of much longer continuance, which might comprehend more nations within its federative arrangements, and perhaps connect the interests of all the regions of the earth. The system of policy dissipated by the revolution of France was not truly extended beyond the governments of central and southern Europe, the governments of the north having composed but an imperfect combination, apparently relative to some future disposition of political interests. It is now manifest that the northern governments must be included in the future arrangements, and Russia shall probably be found to be, instead of France, the predominating government.

But whatever may happen in regard to future arrangements of policy, a great mass of improvement of every kind has been actually collected in the period of history now concluded, and will be transmitted as a rich inheritance to succeeding ages. The mechanic arts have been prodigiously improved by new discovery; science has been widely extended in all the regions of intellectual enquiry; litera-

ture has exercised the imagination and the affections, and has refined the intercourses of society; education has been communicated to multitudes, whom the habits of other ages would have abandoned to unmitigated ignorance; milder and more generous notions of policy, if not actually observed, have at least been commonly acknowledged and professed. The particulars of this improvement have been detailed, and its progress has been noted from the barbarism of the sixth to the civilisation of the eighteenth century. Besides all this general improvement of the whole frame of society, two precious models have been preserved by the British empire for the coming age, the salutary examples of a well-balanced government and of a well-constituted church, so that the nations are supplied with the best objects of imitation both in policy and in religion.

It has been shown that the British constitution was the work of many ages, and was formed by the co-operation of very numerous, and very various agencies. Other nations of Europe inherited from a remote antiquity the principles of popular government; but in none, except the people of the British empire, has that original independence been matured into a well-balanced government. Such a form of government however, though it could have been generated only in the peculiar circumstances of Great Britain, may yet, since it has been thus generated, be imitated by other states, in which it could not have been originated, or at least may furnish principles of popular and mixed constitutions, which may be accommodated to their respective circumstances. This very constitution indeed seems to be at the present time undergoing an important change of its adjustment, in receiving a great augmentation of democratic influence. Whether the change now contemplated shall better accommodate the government to the altered circumstances of society, as its advocates contend, or whether it shall destroy the balance of its powers, and overwhelm it in the anarchy of revolutionary violence, it does not fall within the object of the present work to pronounce. Of this expectation we may reasonably rest assured, that, even though it should appear that the present crisis is the result of that decay, to which all the works of men are subject, a government, in which the several powers had been so

happily combined for the maintenance of the social order, will not be suffered to perish finally, but, after some, perhaps brief, period of confusion, will be regenerated to exhibit again to other nations the example of regulated liberty and its attendant blessings.

Of the superior excellence of the church of England we may best form a judgment, by comparing its actual condition with that of the original church of Protestants, constituted by Luther and Melancthon in Germany, and with that of the church afterwards constituted by Calvin at Geneva, as upon principles of more perfect reformation. Both these churches have notoriously departed from their original doctrines, and, wandering in the mazes of a vain philosophy, have at length arrived at a state, in which all the essential tenets of our religion are denied, and by the German church, in particular[4], the profession of it has been reduced to a name. The causes of this lamentable defection have been discovered in the want of those safeguards, by which the stability of the church of England has been secured; of a settled standard of belief for regulating the principles of the clergy, of a prescribed liturgy for regulating the public ministrations of the church, and of a system of superintendence sufficiently coercive for regulating the conduct of its ministers. These advantages have been possessed by the protestant church of England, which therefore now exists a model for the imitation of Protestants of other countries, as the political constitution of the government is the exemplar for the nations, which desire to be free.

Here the author thought it prudent to stop, in presenting to the public the immediately preceding edition of this work. But he conceives that he is now warranted in magnifying still more the importance of that church which has been framed in the result of the multiplied and various combinations of the British government, for it has latterly taken

[4] The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany by the Rev. Hugh James Rose. Cambridge, 1825. For the state of the church of Geneva, see Gilly's Memoir of Felix Neff, pp. 57—61. Since about the year 1705 candidates for holy orders at Geneva have not been required to subscribe the Helvetic Confession, framed in the year 1566. —The Christian Observer for 1826, pp. 693, 694.

its decided position, as the grand agent in evangelizing the eastern and distant regions of the earth. Like the widely spread empire of ancient Rome, Great Britain has acquired a maritime empire far more widely extended, apparently in preparation for another *fulness of time*, in which evangelical truth, first promulgated in the former, might now be disseminated to the remotest countries, especially as the vast and crowded region of China, so long as it were held in reserve from the influences of the Christian nations, is now at length opened to their intercourse, and in some measure even submitted to the control of the British government. To have been instrumental in preparing an agency of so immeasurable importance, might surely be itself deemed sufficient for vindicating all the past arrangements of modern history, as indeed the measures of an all-ruling God.

These considerations may be esteemed to vindicate the providential government of God, by proving that the past transactions of thirteen centuries, various, and complicated, and apparently irregular as they have been, have however been combined to the production of beneficent results, to be transmitted to succeeding ages, as the fruits of his superintendence of the passions of his creatures. If it be conceivable that men should by a wise and beneficent Creator have been abandoned wholly to themselves, to form political combinations without the superintending direction of his providential control, is it to be imagined, that among all the errors and violences of mankind a common tendency towards human improvement should be discoverable, which the Deity might acknowledge as not unworthy of his attributes? Will any man pretend that, through the multiplied and diversified transactions of so many ages, the combinations of wisdom could be seemingly traced in the wanderings of unguided ignorance, and the purposes of goodness in the outrages of uncontrolled ferocity? Cicero, combating the vain notion of Epicurus[5], which attributed the formation of the universe to a fortuitous concourse of atoms, demands why the man, who entertains it, should not likewise believe, that the Annals of Ennius might be composed of the casual combinations of the letters of the alphabet, whereas, he remarks, it is improbable that such combina-

[5] De Naturâ Deorum, lib. ii. cap. xxxvii.

tions could produce a single line. Can we ascribe to the results of ignorance and passion that wisdom of combination, which the Roman philosopher has denied to be reconcilable to mere contingency?

A new order of ages has been begun, which may demand examination in some remote futurity, and may yet more conspicuously manifest the attributes of the Almighty Ruler, as more nearly approaching to the final consummation of the affairs of men. But though the scenes, which are now beginning to be unfolded, seem to promise a wider comprehension of human interests, those, which have been closed upon our view, have displayed a unity and clearness of combination, which may sufficiently establish the persuasion of a directing Providence. When Newton had completed his imperishable system of the planetary world, he broke from his mechanical contemplations into an animated declaration of the wisdom and power of the Being, by whom it had been framed[6]. Shall this then not be thought the legitimate conclusion, to be inferred from the consideration of so much harmony of moral action, all tending to the advancement of human improvement? Shall the arrangement of the planetary system evince his providence, and that of empires and human society, and of mind in all its various combinations, furnish no testimony of the wisdom and power of the great Creator?

This is the system, which it has been proposed to establish for the moral, as for the material world; the system of a God and his providence. It has been shown that, diversified and complicated as the transactions of thirteen centuries have been, they all admit of being reduced to one great system of action, the unity of which must prove the control of a presiding Deity, as the combination of the planetary system glorifies its author. In one respect indeed the view of the moral world discovers even a more glorious revelation of the attributes of God. The planet revolves for ever in its appointed orbit, and the noblest triumph of mechanical philosophy is[7] to have ascertained, that the per-

[6] Philos. Nat. Princ. Mathem., schol. gen. [7] Towards the end of the last century "it was shown by Lagrange and Laplace, that the arrangements of the solar system are stable: that in the long run the orbits and motions remain unchanged; and that the changes in the

turbations of its course are all compensated within determined periods, and its movement exempted from decay. But man, weak and erring though he be, is still progressive in his moral nature. He does not move round for ever in one unvarying path of moral action. The combinations of his history exhibit, not only the unity of the material system, but also the continually advancing improvement belonging to being of a higher order.

The great poet of antiquity[8] has painted in a glowing colouring the radiant splendour, which in a calm and moonlight night bursts on the baffled gaze, and brings into a sudden day the woods and promontories. It is thus that the system, here proposed, would pour a light from heaven upon the dark and troubled scene of human history. As the shepherd of the poet rejoiced at the glory, which struck his corporeal view, so might we exult at the removal of that dismal gloom, which must enfold all the concerns of this sublunar world, if no persuasion of a providential government illuminate the moral prospect. Cheered however by this persuasion, we may calmly hold our allotted station, confiding in the protection of an all-gracious Being, as we must be assured that by all the vicissitudes of an agitated world the purposes of goodness must ever be eventually accomplished, for 'the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'

orbits, which take place in shorter periods, never transgress certain very moderate limits."—Whewell's Bridgewater Treatise, p. 163. Lond., 1834. It has however been recently ascertained from the retardation sustained by a comet of very small density, and of very frequent recurrence, that a resisting medium does exist in the space, in which the planetary motions are performed; and it has consequently been inferred that the system must, however slowly, tend towards destruction, the necessary result of the continued diminution of the velocity of a planet being that it should be brought into contact with the sun. But the retardation must in this case be so exceedingly minute, as only to furnish an argument against the eternal duration of the system.—Ibid., pp. 191, etc.

[8] Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄστρα φαεινὴν ἀμφὶ σελήνην
Φαίνετ' ἀριπρεπέα, ὅτε τ' ἔπλετο νήνεμος αἰθὴρ,
Ἔκ τ' ἔφανον πᾶσαι σκοπιαὶ, καὶ πρώονες ἄκροι,
Καὶ νάπαι· οὐρανόθεν δ' ἄρ' ὑπεῤῥάγη ἄσπετος αἰθὴρ,
Πάντα δέ τ' εἴδεται ἄστρα γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα ποιμήν.

Iliad, viii. 551, &c.

COMBINATIONS OF GENERAL POLICY.

BOOK I.

FROM THE SUPPRESSION OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE TO THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

The fall of the western empire left Europe prepared for entering into new arrangements of policy, though not without the struggles, which excite and draw forth into activity the energies of nations. The people, which had been corrupted and exhausted by the debasing influence of a despotic government, were regenerated by the irruptions of barbarian tribes, the chief of which had received some preparatory civilisation, having been for a considerable time established within the limits of the empire. By these the Roman name and usages were still respected, but Italy no longer contained a power, which could aspire to vindicate its former dominion. A new power indeed soon manifested itself amidst the divisions of that country, and, favoured by the ancient dignity of the Roman city, asserted, as it still continues to assert, a spiritual dominion over the consciences of men. As its ecclesiastical led very directly to secular pretensions, a claim of secular sovereignty was after some time boldly promulgated. This claim was in various governments variously received, encountering in some a strenuous resistance; and, though no general sovereignty was established, the efforts by which the claim was maintained, exercised, directly or indirectly, most important influences.

This new power of the papacy must have exercised a salutary influence on the conquerors of the west by maintaining among them some reverence for religion, by holding among them the language of peace, and even by establishing some ties of communication and intercourse. In three important particulars also it has influenced the general frame of European society. It in its earlier policy reestablished

the western empire, out of which the new order of European relations has arisen; it was afterwards the mainspring of those fanatical expeditions, which powerfully, and as it seems usefully, modified the political and social condition of Europe; and in a later age, when the governments of Europe were prepared for establishing a balanced system of federative policy, it supplied to the adverse parties from the contending parties of the church in the struggles of the reformation, principles more powerful and more generally influential, than any which considerations merely political could furnish.

As France was by its extent and position prepared to be the site of the principal government of Europe, it was naturally that in which the first germ of the general order is discoverable. That original germ was accordingly the little kingdom of Clovis, included between the Rhine, the ocean, the Loire, and the kingdom of Burgundy, formed in religious connexion with the rising see of Rome. The system was partly developed in the empire of Charlemagne, extending over the whole of France together with Germany and Italy, and being more closely connected with the latter by the restoration of the imperial dignity of the west. A further development occurred in the year 888, when Germany and Italy became detached, and this was rendered more complete in the year 962, when the imperial dignity, becoming permanently connected with Germany, constituted between that kingdom and Italy, especially the papacy, the relation by which the subsequent arrangements of the two countries were determined. In this manner preparation appears to have been made for the formation of an incipient system of federative policy in each of these two countries. Again, by the establishment of the Normans in France in the year 911, and the consequent conquest of England in the year 1066, preparation was nearly at the same time made for constituting such a relation of rivalry and opposition between the governments of France and England, as might dispose them to assume the positions of principal states in a more advanced condition of the arrangements of Europe, in which a more perfect order should be developed.

BOOK II.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY TO THE REFORMATION.

THE systematic arrangement of the political interests of the world manifested in this period a considerable and various development, though not yet exhibiting a regular organisation of its numerous members.

The great struggle of the papacy and the empire had done its work both in Italy and in Germany. In the former country it had established the independence of the republics of Tuscany, the chief among which was Florence, distinguished both by its eminence in art, and by a political energy, which an extreme spirit of democracy had inspired, and to this state it had presented as an object of jealous apprehension the alarming aggrandisement of Milan, in which the antecedent independence of the republics of Lombardy had terminated. A balancing system might probably have been formed in these circumstances, but the general development of the policy of Europe appears to have been better promoted by transferring the apprehensions of Florence from Milan to Venice, which was the result of the encroachments of the former on the latter state, as they excited it to seek territorial acquisitions in Italy, while Milan was reduced to weakness by the hostilities of France. In these circumstances, Lorenzo de Medici first conceived a plan for not only forming, but permanently maintaining a balance of power, which might secure the safety of the Florentine republic. The arrangement was indeed of short duration, for it was terminated with the life of that distinguished man; but it brought into action the principles of the new policy, and by involving France and Germany in the confederacy opposed to the formidable power of Venice, prepared those greater powers for proceeding to form and maintain on similar principles a more considerable combination.

For receiving this new system of balanced policy, and extending its operation, Germany was at this time fully

prepared, the relaxation of its government in the struggle with the papacy having been carried as far as was at all consistent with any remaining unity, so that the several states of the empire entered into diverse and even adverse confederacies. Into a government thus prepared had moreover been introduced the grand division of the western church, a principle of mutual opposition much more powerful and pervading than the merely political division of the Ghibelins and Guelfs had been in the arrangements of Italian policy. For bringing this new principle of dissension to bear upon the parties of Germany it had been so ordered, that the emperor should become connected in interest with that papal power, to which his predecessors had been so strenuously opposed, and that by an extraordinary combination of inheritances he should become an object of general apprehension. A new government was at the same time formed within the German territory by the Swiss confederacy to receive and nurture a distinct portion of the reformed religion, and thus to maintain within the reformed church a balance of theological principle.

To this interior arrangement was added a combination of the two Mohammedan states of Turkey and Persia, fitted to exercise an external agency on the formation of the new system. The Turks were brought into Europe, and placed in possession of the ancient capital of the eastern empire, whence they might easily press upon the German emperor, if at any time he should be inconveniently powerful for his opponents; and lest this restraining power should unseasonably occupy his forces, the Persian government, adverse to the Turkish in a Mohammedan schism, was prepared to check and restrain the Ottomans. Nor was the auxiliary provision for the protection of Germany against this once formidable enemy limited to this occasional agency of Persia, for Poland and Hungary appear to have been interposed and fitted for its general and ordinary defence. Germany was the matrix of the political combinations of Europe and of the world, and well deserved to be covered from every injurious impression.

These arrangements belonged to the relation constituted between the papacy and the empire, which they tended to develop into an earlier form of federative policy among the

governments of Europe. Another and wholly distinct relation had been constituted between France and England; but, as this belonged to a later and more perfect form of general policy, its development within this and the next period was confined to the reciprocal agency of these two governments in bringing forward and maturing their respective principles and resources.

In the mean time some little development began to be manifested of a separate but a secondary and imperfect system of governments, surrounding the Mediterranean of the north. Russia, which had received from Constantinople not a little early refinement, together with the doctrine of the Greek church, and had then undergone the rough discipline of subjection to a tribe of Tatars, continued through a period exceeding two centuries, was in the latter part of the fifteenth century ruled by a sovereign in every particular qualified to animate it with new vigour, and to assert its importance among nations. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, having been more than a century, though with some interruption, connected in the union of Calmar, which has been compared in its primordial character to the empire of Charlemagne, were early in the sixteenth century (in the year 1524) distributed into two governments, one comprehending Denmark and Norway, the other Sweden alone, prepared for maintaining the balance of the Baltic, and for acting, as occasion might require, either upon Germany in the development of the principal system, or, the latter of them, upon Russia for drawing forth its energies, and bringing it within the relations of European policy. Poland on the other hand, during this period the principal of the northern governments, had relation to the southern, rather than to the other governments of the north, serving as an exterior bulwark for their protection against Tatarian invasion.

Nor should it be omitted that, at the close of this second period new discoveries of maritime communication had opened the distant regions of the world to the activity and enterprise of Europeans, thus making preparation for introducing the power of commercial ascendency into the combinations of a policy embracing all the interests of the earth.

BOOK III.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

When the plan of a federative policy opposed to a predominant power had been maintained in action during a few years, for the protection of Florence against the domination of Venice, it was from this combination introduced among the greater governments of Europe. This appears to have been effected by the aid of the loosely connected government of the German empire, in which a portion of the states might easily be opposed to the controlling authority, even entering into alliances with foreign powers for support. From a government so constructed the transition was easy to an arrangement combining in its relations governments distinct and independent. We accordingly find first a German period of federative policy, in which a struggle was maintained within the empire, though not to the exclusion of foreign states, and then a period of wider combination, in which the sovereign of France, not the emperor, was the object of general apprehension. This third book embraces the German period, and, together with the arrangements then completed, those others also which prepared the transition to the French system at its close.

For maintaining with sufficient vigour this great struggle of policy some stronger and more pervading principle of action appears to have been required, than any which merely human policy could supply. This was furnished in the German period by the reformation, which gave to every individual an interest of the strongest kind on the one side, or on the other; and the same laxity of government, which had fitted Germany for being the recipient of the political struggle, fitted it also for receiving and cherishing the religious movement in a portion of its slightly connected provinces, while it was discountenanced and opposed by the sovereign. If indeed the two parties had been simply opposed in religion, as in political interests, the struggle of Europe would have degenerated into a religious feud, and

could scarcely have been instrumental to a beneficial result. This consequence however appears to have been precluded by the necessity, which drove the protestant states to seek the assistance of France. The French government, opposed at home to its own protestant subjects, could not easily gain the confidence of the protestants of Germany; and it was only after the death of the king of Sweden, when these were left destitute of any other aid, that they could determine to enter into an alliance so adverse to their religious convictions. Then the war of Germany assumed a political character, and the treaty of Westphalia, by which it was at length concluded, became the fundamental arrangement of the political interests of Europe.

In commencing the German system, Spain, during the long reign of the emperor Charles V. was united with the empire, a combination important to the arrangement not only as it strengthened the power then assuming a predominance, but also as it connected the emperor with the papacy, and so placed him in opposition to his protestant subjects. The two governments were separated at its conclusion; and while the empire was left alone to maintain its position, though with the friendly co-operation of the other branch of the house of Austria, Spain appears to have been separately engaged in developing the maritime combinations belonging to that other system, which was subsequently established. This other government, then the most considerable in Europe, acted at the same time powerfully and effectually for the general protection of Christendom, by crushing the maritime power of the Turks in the famed battle of Lepanto.

One part of the preparatory agency of Spain appears to have consisted in exciting the maritime energies of Great Britain, so as to qualify this state for becoming the balancing power opposed to France in the future arrangements. This was effected in the formidable aggression of the *armada*, consequent on the brief union of the two crowns in the marriage of Mary of England with Philip II. of Spain. It was not however sufficient that the maritime energies of a government separated by its insular position should be thus excited, and a further provision appears accordingly to have been also made by the agency of Spain in forcing the

Dutch provinces into independence, and thus constituting them the maritime member of the continent. This little republic, depending on Great Britain for its safety, became the bond which connected the latter with continental interests, in the accession of the stadtholder to the British throne. A league of the two maritime states was thus concluded against continental predominance, and a new system was arranged more suitably to the general order than the former, the empire having in the mean time descended from its pre-eminence of power.

In the northern countries of Europe some progress was at the same time made in the development of a secondary and imperfect system of governments, the immediate object of which appears to have been the improvement of Russia, in reference perhaps to some still future and more comprehensive combination of political interests. This wide territory, though situated within the limits of Europe, being in its character rather Asiatic than European, its improvement and consequent aggrandisement could be completed only through the agency of some other, which had been fashioned in the combinations of European policy. The state so employed was Sweden. Extricated at length from the constrained union of Calmar, it was then disciplined in a long series of various hostility, and was finally by the treaty of Oliva placed in that pre-eminence, which had been previously occupied by Poland for the protection of the more southern states. This it continued to occupy until the time had arrived, when it might advantageously exercise its power in imparting to Russia the discipline of its hostility, and was even brought into direct collision with it in the acquisition of the maritime provinces of that empire.

As at the completion of the second period of this review of modern history, Italy, having discharged its interesting functions, had as it were retired into obscurity and unimportance, so at the conclusion of this the third period did several governments, which had been active and conspicuous, withdraw as it were into subordinate positions, their activity being no longer necessary to the general combinations. Turkey, before so formidable in its aggressions, ceased from the peace of Carlowitz to influence the counsels of the west, and with it Persia also, by which it had been

controlled, became powerless and inefficient: Spain, from being a powerful ally of the empire, and even itself the terror of the protestant states, sunk into a mere appendage of the neighbouring government of France: and Poland, in the prevailing anarchy of its ill-arranged constitution, lost altogether its political importance, and remained to be the spoil of the neighbouring governments, especially of Russia.

BOOK IV.

FROM THE BRITISH TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

The first grand alliance, concluded by William III. of Great Britain in the year 1689, may be considered as having commenced the later system of the federative policy of Europe, as it brought these countries into the combination of the states opposed to the predominance of France. The war then begun was terminated in the year 1697 by the treaty of Ryswick, which may be considered as for the time constituting the new order. It remained for the second grand alliance, concluded by the same king about six months before his death, to make the necessary preparation for completing the arrangement, which was accordingly accomplished by the treaty of Utrecht concluded fourteen years afterwards, and by the barrier-treaty, which followed at an interval of two years. The earlier grand alliance placed the British government at the head of a confederacy opposed to the ascendency of France, the later secured the permanence of this combination by the provisions of the two treaties, in which it terminated. While these permitted the exhausted government of Spain to fall into a connexion with the French monarchy, the Spanish Netherlands were transferred to the emperor, the Dutch provinces were protected by a barrier intrusted to the emperor in conjunction with them, and to Great Britain, which in the mean time had been strengthened by the incorporate union of Scotland, various dependencies were assigned, important to its mari-

time aggrandisement. In Italy indeed some further adjustment of the relative interests of Austria and Spain was still required, nor was this effected until twenty-five years had elapsed, at which time Spain recovered for one of the princes of the reigning family the kingdom of the two Sicilies, and Austria added to the duchies of Milan and Mantua those of Parma and Placentia.

The peculiar functions of Germany having been discharged, its interior policy in this period underwent a corresponding change, a new order being begun in it by the formation of the kingdom of Prussia out of some of its provinces, for which a sufficient balance was soon afterwards provided in the augmented strength of Austria, resulting from the final reduction of Hungary, soon afterwards its great support. The struggle between these governments eventually drove Austria into a connexion with France, but the support of Prussia was then sufficient for maintaining the continental interests of Great Britain, and the connexion with France had become more suitable to the general policy of Europe. While Austria, which in the preceding period had been the predominant government, thus descended even below the rank of secondary importance, the two now leading governments, France and Great Britain, maintained the new arrangement for a considerable time in a harmony, which could not fail to be favourable to their own and the general prosperity, various causes having generated between them an amicable correspondence notwithstanding their political rivalry.

It is remarkable that the arrangement, which closed the navigation of the Scheldt, was the key both of the German and of the French system of federative policy, having been originally established by the treaty of Westphalia, and being maintained by that of Utrecht. In the former case it had been a result of the prevailing jealousy of the power of Austria, in the latter it arose from a jealous apprehension of interference with the commerce of the Dutch provinces. The restriction was naturally regarded with augmented aversion in a more commercial period, and it was accordingly in this part of its combinations that the new system finally gave way.

The decline of the system was begun at the peace of Aix-

la-Chapelle, concluded in the year 1748, by which Prussia was established in the possession of Silesia, the more immediate result of which was that Austria, which had been the ally of Great Britain against France, was driven into a connexion with the latter, and the more remote one that a commencement was then made of unprincipled spoliation, which set all political arrangement at defiance. The actual connexion of Austria with France occurred in the seven-years' war, which followed at an interval of eight years; and this war had the further operation of drawing Spain into a fàmily compact with France, and thus uniting in a strict alliance against Great Britain the forces of the two governments. The resources of Great Britain were however on the other hand much augmented by the acquisition of the remaining provinces of North America on the eastern side of the Mississippi together with Nova Scotia and Canada. These acquisitions however, while they for the present maintained the balance of the system, eventually effected its destruction, for the removal of their apprehension of neighbouring enemies soon generated the independence of the earlier provinces, and the interference of France in the struggle brought on the revolution of that country, and with it the ruin of the whole policy of Europe.

While this great system of policy was proceeding from its formation to its maturity, and thence to its dissolution, another, less considerable in its component members and less perfect in its combination, was also proceeding among the northern governments of Europe, not however to its dissolution, but rather to its completion in the aggrandisement of Russia, which appears to have been its object in reference to some yet future arrangement. In the interval between the peace of Oliva, concluded in the year 1660, and that of Nystadt, concluded in the year 1721, Sweden possessed the ascendency among the four governments of the north, but only, as it appears, to transfer it to Russia by the latter of the two treaties, when the energies of that empire should have been sufficiently stimulated by the hostilities of Charles XII. For these hostilities Sweden had been prepared by a revolution, which, as had before occurred in Denmark, rendered the sovereign absolute, and was then

provoked to engage in enterprises of aggression by the combined hostility of the three other governments.

As the function of Denmark appears to have been discharged in acting upon Sweden, so that of Sweden appears to have been subsequently discharged in acting upon Russia, after which this government, like the former, fell back into the comparative unimportance, which was suited to its local position and its limited resources. Poland in the same interval, having discharged its varied functions in both the southern and northern systems of Europe, sank into an armed anarchy, incapable alike of securing its own well-being, and of entering as a government into a useful combination with other states. Russia on the other hand was continually, though slowly, advancing to greatness, such as has since enabled it to interpose with effect in restraining the evils attending the dissolution of the southern system, and has perhaps prepared it to be, in another age, the controlling power of a new and more comprehensive combination of governments.

THE

PRINCIPAL EVENTS OF MODERN HISTORY,

WITH THEIR TIMES.

THE FIRST PERIOD, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

	YEAR
THE Roman empire divided into eastern and western - - - -	404
The Saxons arrived in England - -	449
Spain conquered by the Goths - -	472

The middle ages begun, by the suppression of the western empire in the reduction of Rome by the barbarians - - - -	476
The kingdom of France begun by the Franks under Clovis - - - -	486
The Lombard kingdom of Italy begun - -	569
Mohammed born - - - -	----
The feudal system begun in Lombardy - -	584
Gregory I., the founder of the papal monarchy, pope - - - - -	590
England subjected to the papacy soon after -	597
The flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina, or the *hegyra*, - - - -	622
The conquest of Arabia completed by him -	632
Syria conquered by the Arabs - -	633
Egypt conquered by the Arabs - -	640
Persia conquered by the Arabs - -	651
Northern Africa conquered by the Arabs -	709
Spain conquered from the Goths by the Arabs -	711

	YEAR
A Christian kingdom of Spain founded in Asturias by Pelayo - - - -	718
The feudal system begun in France - -	719
The Arabs stopped in their progress into Europe by Charles Martel in the great battle of Tours -	732
The Lombard kingdom of Italy reduced by Charlemagne of France - - -	774
Charlemagne created emperor by the pope -	800
Revival of commerce begun in Italy - -	——
The Saxon heptarchy of England united by Egbert king of Wessex - - -	827
The connected history of Denmark begun -	840
Ruric king of the Russians - - -	864
The connected history of Norway begun -	885
Italy and Germany detached from the French empire - - - - -	888
The Normans settled in France - -	911
The manufacture of wool began to flourish in the Netherlands - - - -	960
The imperial dignity attached to the crown of Germany in the person of Otho I. - -	962
Mieskri, or Miceslaus, king of Poland - -	964
The silver mines of Germany discovered about -	968
Chivalry begun in the southern provinces of France about - - - -	1000
The connected history of Sweden begun -	1035
The common law of England collected by Edward the Confessor soon after - - -	1041
England conquered by the Normans of France -	1066
The feudal law imposed in England - -	1067
The struggle between the papacy and the German empire begun - - - -	1075
The Normans expelled the Greeks from southern Italy, and conquered Sicily from the Arabs -	1090
The crusades begun - - -	1096
The struggle between the papacy and the German empire ended by a compromise - -	1122
The commencement of the kingdom of Portugal -	1139
Ireland subjected to the papacy - -	1152
Ireland invaded by the English - -	1170

	YEAR
The funding system begun by Venice about -	1175
Northern Italy independent of Germany by the league of Constance - - -	1183
A German dynasty begun in the two Sicilies -	1194
The inquisition begun in the southern provinces of France by pope Innocent III., who completed the papal monarchy - - -	1204
Roger Bacon born - - -	1214
The great charter of England - -	1215
India conquered by the Arabs, except the Deccan	1218
The hanseatic league of commerce among the cities of Germany - - - -	1241
Russia subdued by the Tatars - -	1243
Counties first represented in the parliament of England - - - -	1254
Bills of exchange introduced by the pope -	1255
The caliphate of Bagdad suppressed by the Tatars	1258
The crusades ended - - -	1270
Wales reduced by Edward I. of England -	1282
Boroughs first represented in the parliament of England - . - -	1283

SUPPLEMENTARY OBSERVATIONS.

Ecclesiastical learning cultivated in Ireland in the eighth century, and teachers supplied to the continent in the ninth.—Scientific learning first acquired from the Arabs of Spain by Gerbert, who in the year 999 became pope, under the appellation of Sylvester II.—The medical school of Salerno received its knowledge from the Arabs in the course of the eleventh century, before the year 1075.—Roger Bacon born in the year 1214, the great importer of Arabian science into England. The communication of Arabian poetry probably begun in the year 1085.—The lyric poetry of the *troubadours* of the south of France begun towards the close of the eleventh century.—The romance-writing of the *trouveurs* of the north of France begun towards the middle of the twelfth. The Sicilian school of Italian poetry towards the same time.

THE SECOND PERIOD, TO THE REFORMATION.

	YEAR
The Ottoman government begun by Othman -	130.
Dante began his *Divina Commedia* - -	——
The states general of France first assembled -	1303
Petrarca born - - - -	1304
Boccacio born - - - -	1313
The manufacture of wool begun in England -	1331
Casimir *the great*, king of Poland - -	1333
Cannon first used at the siege of Piegillaume -	1338
Wars of England with France begun - -	1339
The Turks invaded Europe - - -	1341
The house of commons of England formed -	1343
Chaucer born - - - -	1350
Wicliffe began to teach in England - -	1360
The crown of Poland began to be elective -	1370
Lithuania united to Poland - - -	1386
The union of Calmar, connecting Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, formed - - -	1397
The struggle of the royal houses of York and Lancaster in England begun - -	1399
The Zuyder Zee opened to the ocean about -	1401
Huss began to teach in Bohemia - -	1408
The Portuguese discoveries of the coast of Africa begun - - - -	1410
The art of printing invented in Germany soon after	1449
The middle ages ended at the reduction of Constantinople by the Turks - - -	1453
The wars of England with France ended -	1457
The domination of the Tatars in Russia ended -	1462
Dunbar, a Scotish poet, born - -	1465
The struggle of the two royal houses in England ended - - - -	1471
Copernicus born - - - -	1472
Ariosto born - - - -	1474
The inquisition established in Castile - -	1478
The two Christian kingdoms of Aragon and Castile united - - - -	1479
Lorenzo de Medici negotiated for Florence against Venice a treaty for a permanent *balance of power* in Italy - - - -	1480

	YEAR
The Cape of Good Hope passed by the Portuguese - - - -	1484
The Arabs finally reduced in Spain - -	1492
The West Indies discovered by Columbus -	——
Tasso born - - - -	1493
The Italian expedition of Charles VIII. of France	1494
The Italian expedition of Louis XII. of France	1499
The piratical states of Barbary begun - -	——
The Swiss confederacy independent of Germany -	1500
The most illustrious period of the arts in Italy begun - - - -	——
Brazil discovered by the Portuguese - -	1501
The dynasty of the Sophis in Persia begun -	1502
The king of Castile and Aragon also king of the two Sicilies - - - -	1503
The American slave-trade begun - -	——
The Portuguese dominion in India begun -	1507
Navarre united to Castile and Aragon - -	1515
Venice humbled by the league of Cambrai -	1516
Charles, afterwards emperor, succeeded to the Spanish dominions - -	——

THE THIRD PERIOD, TO THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

The reformation begun in Germany by Luther -	1517
Egypt and Syria reduced by the Turks -	——
Camoens born - - - -	——
Charles, king of Spain, emperor as Charles V. -	1519
Mexico conquered by the Spaniards - -	1521
The union of Calmar dissolved into two states, one composed of Denmark and Norway, the other Sweden - - - -	1524
The Mogul empire in India begun - -	1526
Vienna besieged by the Turks - -	1529
The protest of the German reformers, whence the name of protestants - - -	——
The Lutheran reformation received in Sweden -	——
The confession of Augsburgh - -	1530

	YEAR
Liberty suppressed in Italy by the reduction of Florence - - - -	1530
Perú conquered by the Spaniards - -	1533
The supremacy of the crown established in England - - - - -	1534
The union of Wales with England completed -	1535
The Lutheran reformation received in Denmark -	1536
The supremacy of the crown established in Ireland	1537
The cortes of Castile reduced to insignificance -	1539
The Jesuits instituted - - -	1540
Calvin established his system at Geneva :	1541
The council of Trent assembled - -	1545
Tycho Brahé born - - -	1546
The Portuguese empire in India completed -	1547
The liturgy of the church of England prepared -	1548
Cervantes born - - - -	1549
The liturgy of the church of England revised, and the articles prepared - - -	1552
Hooker born - - - -	1553
Spencer born - - - -	——
The rise of the puritans of England - -	1554
The reformation established in Germany -	1555
The reformers persecuted in the Netherlands -	1559
The liturgy of the church of England again revised	——
The reformation begun in Scotland - -	1560
The act of uniformity passed in Ireland -	——
Bacon born - - - -	——
The articles of the church of England revised -	1562
The civil wars of France begun - -	——
The council of Trent dissolved - -	1563
Galileo born - - - -	1564
Shakspeare born - - - -	——
The puritans separated from the church of England	1566
The bull of Pius V. issued against Elizabeth queen of England - - - -	1570
The naval power of the Turks ruined in the battle of Lepanto by Spain and the Venetians -	1571
Kepler born - - - -	——
The massacre of saint Bartholomew's day in France	1572
The war of the Netherlands begun by Spain -	——

	YEAR
The union of Utrecht formed, and Dutch republic begun - - - -	1579
The crown of Poland formally elective -	——
The bull of Gregory XIII. against Elizabeth queen of England - - - -	1580
The union of Spain and Portugal - -	——
The first penal law in England against popery -	1585
Mary, queen of Scotland, executed - -	1587
The Spanish *armada* sent against England -	1588
The first newspaper published in England, by order of queen Elizabeth, - - -	——
The presbyterian system established in Scotland	1592
The university of Dublin founded - -	1593
The cortes of Aragon ruined - -	——
The rebellion of the earl of Tyrone in Ireland -	1595
The government of Spain bankrupt - -	1596
Des Cartes born - - - -	——
The civil wars of France ended, and the edict of Nantes published - - -	1598
The East India company of England formed -	1600
The first poor-law in England - -	1601
Ireland reduced - - - -	1603
Canada settled by the French - -	——
The gunpowder-plot in England - -	1605
The Dutch settlements in India begun -	——
Virginia settled by the English - -	1606
Corneille born - - - -	——
Torricelli born - - - -	1608
The telescope invented - - -	——
Milton born - - - -	——
The plantation of Ulster in Ireland - -	1609
Arabs, or Moors, expelled from Spain - -	1610
The first general parliament in Ireland -	1613
The last meeting of the states general of France	1614
Rise of the independents in England - -	1616
The German war of thirty years begun -	1618
The synod of Dort assembled for determining the question of Arminianism - - -	——
Molière born - - - -	1620

	YEAR
The emigration of puritans from England to North America	1621
The law of nations published by Grotius	1625
Sallo, a Frenchman, the first editor of a literary journal, born	1626
Dryden born	1631
Locke born	1632
Vienna besieged by the Turks, and relieved by the Poles under Sobieski	1633
The articles of the church of Ireland reduced to conformity with those of England	1634
Racine born	1639
The first invasion of England by the Scots	1640
The Irish rebellion	1641
The union of Spain and Portugal dissolved	——
The civil war in England begun	1642
A general assembly of Roman Catholics in Ireland	——
Newton born	——
The solemn league and covenant of the Scots	1643
The second invasion of England by the Scots	1644
Flamsteed born	1646
Leibnitz born	——
The third invasion of England by the Scots	1648
The peace of Westphalia, the foundation of the international law of Europe	——
Charles I., king of Great Britain, executed	1649
The house of lords in England abolished	——
The navigation-act of England	1652
Oliver Cromwell protector	1653
Treaty of the Pyrenees between the French and Spaniards	1659
The restoration of the British monarchy	1660
The feudal tenures abolished in England	——
The treaty of Oliva between Sweden and Poland	——
The treaty of Copenhagen, for including Denmark	——
The Danish monarchy absolute	——
The corporation-act in England	1661
The act of uniformity in England	——
The act of settlement in Ireland	1662
Addison born	1664

	YEAR
Swift born	1667
The treaty of Lisbon between Spain and Portugal	1668
The treaty of the Hague between Portugal and the Dutch	1669
Holland invaded by Louis XIV.	1672
Anarchy of Poland	——
The test-act in England	1673
The latest additions (for the county and the city of Durham and the town of Newark) made to the representation of England	——
Romanists excluded from the parliament of England	1678
The peace of Nimeguen	——
The distinction of Whigs and Tories begun in England	1680
The Swedish monarchy absolute	——
The revocation of the edict of Nantes in France	1685
The British revolution	1688
Pope born	——

THE FOURTH PERIOD, TO THE REVOLUTION OF FRANCE.

William, stadtholder of Holland, king of Great Britain	1689
The first grand alliance against France	——
The act of toleration and bill of rights passed in England	1690
The treaty of Limerick in Ireland	1691
Bradley born	1692
The triennial act in England	1694
Voltaire born	——
Quesnai, the founder of the economists of France, born	——
The penal code of Ireland begun	1695
The peace of Carlowitz concluded with the Turks	1699
Prussia a kingdom	1700
The war of the Spanish succession begun	1701
The second grand alliance against France	——

	YEAR
The Hanoverian succession in Great Britain established	1701
Petersburgh founded	1703
The incorporate union of Scotland with England	1707
The penal code in Ireland completed	1709
The Swedes defeated by the Russians at Pultowa	——
Rousseau born	1712
The governments of Aragon, Valentia, and Catalonia, assimilated to that of Castile	1713
The peace of Utrecht	——
Diderot born	1714
The barrier-treaty	1715
Scotish rebellion	——
The septennial act in England	1716
D'Alembert born	1717
The peace of Nystadt between Russia and Sweden	1721
The patriarchate of Russia suppressed	——
Black born	1728
Goldsmith born	——
The rise of methodism in England	1729
Cavendish born	1731
Priestley born	1733
The kingdom of the two Sicilies ceded by Austria to a prince of Spain	1738
Herschell born	——
The Mogul empire ruined by Nadir Shah	1739
The war of the Austrian succession begun	1740
The sect of philosophers appeared in France about	——
The secession of Whitfield from Wesley	1741
Scotish rebellion	1745
The heretable jurisdictions of Scotland suppressed	1746
The peace of Aix la Chapelle	1748
Laplace born	1749
The English novel begun by Fielding	1750
Louisiana occupied by the French	1753
Alliance of France with Austria	1756
The seven years' war begun	——
The battle of Plassey, in India, gained by the British	1757
Canada, with Louisiana, acquired by Great Britain	1759
The Jesuits suppressed in Portugal	——
The sect of economists formed in France	1760

	YEAR
The Jesuits suppressed in France - -	1762
The family-compact of France and Spain -	1763
The sovereignty of Bengal acquired by Great Britain - - - -	——
The Jesuits suppressed in Spain, Naples, and Parma - - - -	1767
The octennial act in Ireland - - -	1768
The Jesuits suppressed in Austria - -	1769
The first partition of Poland - - -	1772
The suppression of the Jesuits confirmed by the pope - - - -	1773
The steam-engine invented by Watt - -	1774
The war of independence in North America -	1775
France assisted the Americans - -	1778
The first act for the relief of Roman Catholics in Ireland - - - -	——
The armed neutrality of the northern states -	1780
The test-act repealed in Ireland - -	——
The legislative independence of Ireland -	1782
The United States of North America independent	1783
A national convention assembled in Dublin -	——
The revolution of France - - -	1789
The association of united Irishmen formed -	1791
The war of Great Britain with France begun -	1793
The second partition of Poland - -	——
Roman Catholics admitted to the elective franchise in Ireland - - - -	——
Irish rebellion - - - -	1798
The incorporate union of Ireland with Great Britain	1800

ANALYTICAL INDEX.

THE END.

J. BILLING, PRINTER, WOKING, SURREY.

BOHN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

39. SALLUST, FLORUS, and VELLEIUS PATERCULUS, with copious Notes, Biographical Notices, and Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

40. LUCAN'S PHARSALIA, with copious Notes, by H. T. RILEY, B.A.

41. THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS and TYRTÆUS, by the Rev. J. BANKS, M.A. With the Metrical Versions of CHAPMAN. *Frontispiece.*

42. CICERO'S ACADEMICS, DE FINIBUS and TUSCULAN QUESTIONS, by C. D. YONGE, B.A. With Sketch of the Greek Philosophy.

43. ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND ECONOMICS, by E. WALFORD, M.A., with Notes, Analyses, Life, Introduction, and Index.

44. DIOGENES LAERTIUS. LIVES AND OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS, with Notes by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

45. TERENCE and PHÆDRUS, by H. T. RILEY. To which is added SMART'S Metrical Version of Phædrus. *Frontispiece.*

47. ARISTOTLE'S ORGANON, or, Logical Treatises, and the Introduction of Porphyry, with Notes, Analysis, Introduction and Index, by the Rev. O. F. OWEN, M.A. 2 Vols., 3*s.* 6*d.* per Vol.

48 & 49. ARISTOPHANES, with Notes and Extracts from the best Metrical Versions, by W. J. HICKIE, in 2 Vols. *Frontispiece.*

50. CICERO ON THE NATURE OF THE GODS, DIVINATION, FATE, LAWS, REPUBLIC, &c., translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

51. APULEIUS. [The Golden Ass, Death of Socrates, Florida, and Defence or Discourse on Magic]. To which is added a Metrical Version of Cupid and Psyche; and Mrs. Tighe's Psyche. *Frontispiece.*

52. JUSTIN, CORNELIUS NEPOS and EUTROPIUS, with Notes and a General Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

53 & 58. TACITUS. Vol. I. The Annals. Vol. II. The History, Germania, Agricola, &c. With Index.

54. PLATO. Vol VI., completing the work, and containing Epinomis, Axiochus, Eryxias, on Virtue, on Justice, Sisyphus, Demodocus, and Definitions; the Treatise of Timæus Locrus on the Soul of the World and Nature; the Lives of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, Hesychius, and Olympiodorus; and the Introductions to his Doctrines by Alcinous and Albinus; Apuleius on the Doctrines of Plato, and Remarks on Plato's Writings by the Poet Gray. Edited, with Notes, by G. BURGES, M.A., Trin. Coll., Camb. With general Index to the 6 Volumes.

55, 56, 57. ATHENÆUS. The Deipnosophists, or the Banquet of the Learned, translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A., with an Appendix of Poetical Fragments rendered into English verse by various Authors, and a general Index. Complete in 3 Vols.

59. CATULLUS, TIBULLUS, and the VIGIL OF VENUS. A literal prose translation. To which are added Metrical Versions by LAMB, GRAINGER, and others. *Frontispiece.*

60. PROPERTIUS, PETRONIUS ARBITER, and JOHANNES SECUNDUS, literally translated, and accompanied by Poetical Versions, from various sources; to which are added the Love Epistles of ARISTÆNETUS. Edited by W. K. KELLY.

61, 74, & 82. THE GEOGRAPHY OF STRABO, translated, with copious Notes, by W. FALCONER, M.A., and H. C. HAMILTON, Esq. In 3 vols., and Index.

62. XENOPHON'S ANABASIS, or Expedition of Cyrus, and MEMORABILIA, or Memoirs of Socrates, translated by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, with a Geographical Commentary by W. F. AINSWORTH. *Frontispiece.*

63. ———— CYROPÆDIA and HELLENICS, by the Rev. H. DALE, and the Rev. J. S. WATSON.

2 *c*

3 *e*

HE WORKS
YONG B.A